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In 2014, for the first time in its history, the Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies was held in Wales, at Cardiff University. From 25th to 27th April delegates gathered in the John Percival Building to discuss the subject of ‘The Emperor in the Byzantine World’. This subject was chosen in part to reflect the interests of staff in the School of History, Archaeology and Religious Studies who formed the symposium team: Nicholas Baker-Brian, Josef Lössl, myself and, sadly no longer with us, Frank Trombley. Appositely, John Percival himself, who had been Professor of Ancient History at Cardiff, had notable late antique and early medieval expertise.

The symposium was divided into five main sessions, addressing the following themes: Dynasty; Imperial Literature; The Imperial Court; Imperial Duties; and The Material Emperor. Fifteen invited speakers, three in each session, addressed the symposium. Beyond the UK, speakers came from the Netherlands, Germany, Canada, the USA, South Africa and New Zealand. All bar two of these speakers have contributed to this volume; regrettably Michael Grünbart and Eurydice Georganteli, who spoke respectively on ‘The emperor and the patriarch’ and ‘The omnipresent emperor: Money and authority in the Byzantine world’, were unable to provide chapters for the book.

As usual the symposium also featured shorter communications; there were four sessions of these, with speakers hailing from as far afield as Athens, Belfast, Birmingham, Budapest, Cyprus, Ioannina, Istanbul, Leuven, London, Maryland, New York, Oxford, Paris, Rome and Salamanca. It was a pleasure to include three of these communications as chapters in this volume, those by Nikolaos G. Chrissis, Dimitri Korobeinikov and Oscar Prieto Domínguez.

In addition two special lectures were presented. On the Sunday Alessandra Ricci (Koç University) addressed the SPBS AGM on ‘Places of memory, memory of places: What is happening to Istanbul’s Byzantine heritage?’, and on the Friday evening Mark Redknap (National Museum Cardiff) gave a public lecture on ‘Wales and Byzantium: Antiquity, connections and collections’, delivered in the museum itself in the Reardon Smith Lecture Theatre. Mark’s paper is also
included in this volume, emphasising the Welsh character of the symposium but also the significant material relating to Byzantium found in Wales and collected in the museum, especially its coin collection.

I am very glad to be able to record in this Foreword some particular acknowledgements. Especial thanks are owed to Cardiff University itself, for its generous funding of the symposium. Financial support was also provided by the publishers Ashgate and Cambridge University Press, who sponsored the reception held after the public lecture, in the imposing hall of the museum. Thanks are owed to several Cardiff postgraduates who assisted ably with making up conference packs and registering delegates: Panagiotis Sotiropoulos, Ulriika Viheralli and Michal Zytka. Thanks are also due to my Cardiff colleagues Nicholas Baker-Brian, Josef Lössl and Frank Trombley for their support in planning, organising and running the conference. Administrative support was provided in the School by the wonderful Emma Fisher. Thanks are also due as usual to Lis Fouladi and her catering team at Aberdare Hall (the university’s female-only hall of residence, built in 1893), where the symposium feast was held on the Saturday evening.

Regarding the production of the volume itself, I owe an immense debt of gratitude to the publication team: Rowena Loverance and then Angeliki Lymberopoulou as successive Chairs of the Publications Committee of the SPBS, and especially Michael Greenwood at Routledge for his positivity and supportiveness. This debt is also owed to all the contributors themselves, who have borne the production of the volume with such patience and cheerfulness. Emerging from serving a second three-year stint as Head of Department at Cardiff, it is a great pleasure both to be on research leave and to recall happy memories of the symposium held in this special city in spring 2014.

Shaun Tougher
Cardiff, September 2018
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NOTE ON SPELLING OF NAMES

In general I have used Anglicised or Latin forms for names up to the sixth century AD, but Greek forms from the seventh century AD onwards. There are some exceptions however, when an English or Latin form is more familiar (e.g. Heraclius rather than Herakleios, Nicholas rather than Nikolaos).
INTRODUCTION

Shaun Tougher

At the end of the twentieth century and the start of the twenty-first century there were published in quick succession four monographs on the Byzantine empress. In 1999 there appeared Lynda Garland’s *Byzantine Empresses: Women and Power in Byzantium, AD 527–1204* and Barbara Hill’s *Imperial Women in Byzantium 1025–1204: Power, Patronage and Ideology*, and in 2001 there followed Judith Herrin’s *Women in Purple: Rulers of Medieval Byzantium* and Liz James’ *Empresses and Power in Early Byzantium*. As Liz James wryly remarked at the opening of her monograph, ‘Books on Byzantine empresses seem a little like buses at present: you wait a hundred years for one, and then three or four turn up at once’. Remarkably, no such buses have turned up for the Byzantine emperor; there exists no Byzantine equivalent of Fergus Millar’s *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC – AD 337)*. It was this odd fact that inspired the Symposium on which this volume is based, its title modelled on Millar’s famous monograph.

Of course, there have been countless books devoted to particular emperors or aspects of emperors, but the fact remains that for all the centrality of the emperor in the Byzantine world there has been little study of the emperor as emperor. The closest approximation which comes to mind is Gilbert Dagron’s *Empereur et prêtre: Étude sur le ‘césaropapisme’ byzantin* published in 1996, followed in 2002 by an English translation titled *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium*. Nevertheless even this book had a very particular aspect of imperial identity to explore, the religious-cum-political character of the emperor. This entailed exploring imperial ideology, such as the ideal of the Byzantine emperor as a New David, and there has been a rich tradition of studying Byzantine imperial ideology through its literature and art. For instance, a previous Symposium, held in St. Andrews in 1992, focused on Byzantine emperors as New Constantines. Perhaps the rise and nature of gender studies explains in part the focus on the empress rather than the emperor, or perhaps even the traditional gendering of Byzantium as a society marked by powerful women and weak men. As alluded to by James, empresses had already drawn the attention of scholars in the early twentieth century, witness Charles Diehl’s *Figures Byzantines* in 1906 and 1908, notable also for his later *Impératrices de Byzance* of 1960. While Byzantine
empresses, and Byzantine women generally, have received much study, Byzantine men as men have been neglected. It is perhaps telling that the one group of Byzantine men who have received as much attention as empresses in recent years is eunuchs. Several monographs devoted to them have appeared this century; in 2003 there was published Kathryn Ringrose’s *The Perfect Servant: Eunuchs and the Social Construction of Gender in Byzantium*, followed in 2008 by my own *The Eunuch in Byzantine History and Society*, and then in 2014 Charis Messis’ *Les eunuques à Byzance, entre réalité et imaginaire*. This may also reflect the particular gender interest presented by eunuchs, as well as the fact that they too were part of the gendered depiction of Byzantium as a society characterised by corrupt effeminate eunuchs. Non-eunuch men have fared much less well. In Liz James’ edited volume *Women, Men and Eunuchs: Gender in Byzantium*, published in 1997, only one chapter addressed men, Charles Barber’s ‘Homo Byzantinus’.

There are signs, however, that this situation is beginning to change. In 2009 there was published Myrto Hatzaki’s *Beauty and the Male Body in Byzantium: Perceptions and Representations in Art and Text*, and there followed in 2014 Mark Masterson’s *Man to Man: Desire, Homosociality, and Authority in Late-Roman Manhood* and in 2016 Claudia Rapp’s *Brother-Making in Late Antiquity and Byzantium: Monks, Laymen, and Christian Ritual*. Thus Byzantine men are finally coming to the fore in Byzantine Studies, and emperors need to be part of this.

Another factor which might explain the lack of a monograph on the Byzantine emperor is the sheer scale of the subject. Even Millar’s *The Emperor in the Roman World*, covering 368 years in 673 pages, did not address all functions of the Roman emperor, nor did it seek to. Millar declares that the ‘subject-matter’ of his book ‘is certain patterns of contact between the inhabitants of the empire and the emperor in person, and its object is to suggest that these patterns are of fundamental importance in understanding what the Roman empire was’. So, Roman empire rather than Roman emperor. Millar also makes explict that his book does not ‘set out to deal with all aspects of the role played by the emperor; in particular it does not deal with the still neglected topic of his relations with client kings, or his diplomatic contacts with kings and peoples beyond the empire; nor with his role as general, and his relations with the army and with individual soldiers’. In the second edition of his book Millar added an ‘Afterword’, reflecting further on the absences from, and reactions to it. He emphasises again that the book was consciously about the emperor and his civilian subjects; he knew that Brian Campbell’s *The Emperor and the Roman Army, 31 BC–AD 235* was already in preparation. He acknowledges further though that the book did not deal with the visual image of the emperor, the imperial cult and the role of the emperor as priest, or sufficiently with the journeys of the emperor.

Thus to produce a comprehensive and satisfying treatment of the emperor is challenging. Certainly this volume, like the Symposium on which it is based, does not claim to be the last word on the Byzantine emperor, or even to cover all salient aspects of the Byzantine emperor; that would be impossible in a
conference of 15 main papers and a number of short communications, and in a book of 17 chapters. The approach taken to organising the conference and the volume was to address a range of particular and important aspects covering the chronological span of the empire, though the Middle Byzantine period receives more representation than Early or Late Byzantium. The volume sticks to the five aspects chosen for the conference though orders them slightly differently, as follows: Part I: Dynasty: Imperial families; Part II: The emperor’s men: Court and empire; Part III: The emperor as ruler: Duties and ideals; Part IV: Imperial literature: Emperor as subject and author; and Part V: The material emperor: Image, space and empire. Many of the chapters, however, cut across these part divisions, as will be clear from the following overview of the volume.

Part I: Dynasty: Imperial families consists of four chapters, taking us from the so-called Julio-Claudians to the Palaiologoi. In Chapter 1 Mark Humphries tracks imperial succession from Augustus to the Theodosians. As is well known, the Roman empire did not have codified laws of succession, so different principles could co-exist. There was the sentiment that succession should be dynastic, passing from family member to family member, typically from father to son, but at the same time there also existed the view that it was the person best qualified for the role of emperor that should succeed to imperial power. Taking as his starting point the report in the history of Ammianus Marcellinus that in 364 the comes domesticorum Dagalaifus advised Valentinian I not to take his brother Valens as co-emperor but to choose someone else, to put love of the state over love of his family, Humphries surveys imperial succession over five centuries. His main focus is the Early Byzantine period, from Constantine to the end of the Theodosian dynasty, and he argues that dynastic succession was the norm, though ‘there were many different ways of constructing dynastic legitimacy . . . and dynastic claims usually operated alongside other markers of legitimacy, including military success and religious rectitude’. In Chapter 2 Mike Humphreys asks the question ‘to what extent did dynasties actually matter?’ in relation to the Heraclians (610–695, 705–711). Considering the views of George Ostrogorsky that the Heraclians constituted the first Byzantine dynasty and Dagron that it was the Isaurians (717–802) who deserved this recognition, Humphreys reviews what distinguishes this particular family. He finds that its presentation of itself did vary over time, being explicitly dynastic until the reign of Constantine IV, and then drawing more on alternative justifications and models of rulership, turning from David to Christ and from Constantine I to Justinian I (527–565); once again we witness the alternative means of legitimisation available to Byzantine emperors. Humphreys concludes that ‘rather than being its first dynasty, the Heraclians reveal the limits as much as the potential of dynasty in seventh-century Byzantium’. In Chapter 3 Mark Masterson brings us to the Macedonian dynasty, addressing the infamously odd fact that Basil II did not take a wife. Questioning the evidence for a commonly accepted view that religious reasons motivated Basil, Masterson reopens the case for the factor of same-sex desire, through an oration of Symeon the New Theologian and by setting same-sex relationships and attitudes to them within the
cultural context of the time. It transpires that the Byzantines may have had less of a problem with such relationships than might be assumed. The fact remains that Basil’s decision not to marry remains odd within standard male imperial behaviour (only one other emperor did not marry, Constans I); as Masterson says, ‘Basil’s decision not to wed and play a direct part in the continuation of the Macedonian line was a momentous one’. In Chapter 4, the final chapter of Part I, Dimitri Korobeinikov focuses on a specific text to explore questions of dynasty in Late Byzantium. This text is a poem written by Manuel Philes which mentions a certain Demetrios Soulantzos Palaiologos. Korobeinikov carefully tracks the identity of this individual, and this reveals a dynastic relationship between the Byzantine imperial family and the Seljuks of Rûm, through a marriage in the thirteenth century. This dynastic relationship reflects the altered political status of the Byzantine empire by the thirteenth century, a sign of the ‘harsh political reality’ of the power of the Seljuks.

Part II: The emperor’s men: Court and empire consists of three chapters, again taking us from Early to Late Byzantium. In Chapter 5 Meaghan McEvoy focuses on two powerful eastern families and their fortunes in court politics and government in the fifth and early sixth centuries, the Anthemii and the Ardaburii, the former a Roman family, the latter ‘a non-Roman, unashamedly “barbarian” family’. McEvoy also discusses the Theodosian dynasty itself, thus her chapter links strongly with Part I, touching especially on the issue of succession. It was the decision of the Theodosians to avoid marriage – most famously demonstrated in the embracing of virginity by Pulcheria, the sister of Theodosius II – that ultimately brought about its extinction (thus anticipating the case of Basil II and the fate of the Macedonian dynasty). McEvoy contrasts the failed ‘non-alliance policy’ of the Theodosians with the long-lived power and influence of the Anthemii and Ardaburii. Shut out from marriage with the imperial family, these families in effect formed military dynasties themselves. As McEvoy observes, while ‘the Theodosians died out, these military factions would dominate the course of eastern court politics for almost the next half century’. The chapter also demonstrates that ‘despite the pious and civilian image of the court [of Theodosius II], military advisers were never far from the centre of power’. In Chapter 6 Jonathan Shepard considers counsellors of the emperor Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118), focusing in particular on a group of outsiders, the Latins, and examining the role they played in Alexios’ ‘Pivot to the West’. One thinks of Alexios’ plans to secure military support against the Turks as well as his desire to counter the western threat of the Normans, but as Shepard shows, Alexios had wider ambitions than this. Amongst his counsellors and contacts were Latin priests and monks, whose assistance the emperor also sought to achieve ‘Christian consensus’. Thus Shepard’s chapter is about how the emperor sought to harness a particular group of his counsellors to help him achieve his military and religious objectives, a model that ‘lived on – in the form of his grandson Manuel Komnenos’. Chapter 7, the final chapter in Part II, brings us back to the later empire and its changed fortunes. Jonathan Harris explores the identity of the men who served
the last Byzantine emperor Constantine XI Palaiologos, amongst whom were not just native Byzantines but outsiders. Harris demonstrates that despite the drastically reduced fortunes of the empire at this time individuals were still willing to serve the final Byzantine emperors, who wielded ‘a kind of moral authority that was out of all proportion to their political power’, maintaining a vital ‘residual prestige’ even at the end.

Part III: The emperor as ruler: Duties and ideals consists of two chapters, on law and war. At the Symposium this section also included a paper on the religious role of the emperor, Michael Grünbart’s examination of the emperor’s relationship with the patriarch. Regrettably this paper was not able to be included in the volume but there is coverage of the emperor’s religious role provided in other sections: in particular in Part II, Jonathan Shepard’s Chapter 6, which includes discussion of the religious plans of Alexios I Komnenos as has been seen; in Part IV, Oscar Prieto Domínguez’s Chapter 11 examines the image of Theophilos (829–842) in iconodule sources and deals with the role of emperors within the definition of Orthodoxy; and in Part V, Alicia Walker’s Chapter 15 examines ceremonial and imperial images within Hagia Sophia and deals with both the transition of the emperor into ecclesiastical status at particular ceremonial moments and also his relationship with the patriarch within the context of utilisation of the church. The chapters on law and war can also touch on the emperor and religion. In Chapter 8 Bernard Stolte deals succinctly with the emperor and the law. He considers the classical idea of law as king of all things and its continuation in Byzantium, and the Byzantine attitude to the relationship between the emperor and the law. This was a relationship heavily advertised by emperors themselves, most famously Justinian I in the sixth century and Basil I and Leo VI in the ninth and tenth centuries. Infamously, under Basil I there was produced the Eisagoge which contained a statement which asserted that the patriarch embodied law and was above the emperor, but Stolte points out that this idea is unique to this text; it seems to have been a draft or a one-off, perhaps reflecting the ambitions of the patriarch Photios. Stolte also touches on the role of the emperor in receiving and responding to petitions, an aspect so central to Fergus Millar’s The Emperor in the Roman World, and petitioners are also encountered in Lynn Jones’ Chapter 16 in Part V, in which she focuses on emperors ‘on the road’. Ultimately, as Stolte asserts, when it came to law the emperor ‘not only had a monopoly of legislation, but also had the last word in court. Indeed, for practical purposes the basileus was the nomos’. Chapter 9 turns to the question of the military role of the emperor, touched on elsewhere in the volume too, such as McEvoy’s Chapter 5 in Part II, and Savvas Kyriakidis’ Chapter 14 on the history of John Kantakouzenos, in Part IV. Frank Trombley and I concentrate on textual accounts of the military activities of Byzantine emperors in the Middle Byzantine period in particular. Focusing on historiography and informed by ideals found in military manuals, we draw out a range of duties emperors are depicted as fulfilling: organising, directing and funding the army, participating in campaigns, providing leadership by example, demonstrating military expertise and intelligence, and securing and
acknowledging divine support for military activities and successes. These depictions provide a sense of what was expected of emperors in the military arena, but first and foremost they are rhetorical constructs designed to assess whether emperors were ‘good’ or ‘bad’ rulers.

This brings us neatly to Part IV: Imperial literature: Emperor as subject and author. This part has the most chapters, five in total, but in effect of course almost all chapters in the volume deal with images of emperors in literature. Chapter 10 deals with a form of literature fundamental to accessing concepts of what an emperor was like and what he did: imperial panegyric. John Vanderspoel focuses on the Early Byzantine period, when panegyrics are much in evidence compared to the early and high Roman empire; there survives, for instance, the famous Panegyrici latini. Vanderspoel’s approach to the subject is to consider the function of imperial panegyric. He argues that it had an important role to play within communication between emperor and subject, and could play an active role in discourse, rather than being ‘mere flattery’, a concept he challenges anyway. He asserts that ‘political discourse and independent political thought continued to be possible’ in the empire. Panegyric could also be a vehicle for criticism. He provides some particular case studies, from Themistius and Julian, to illustrate his points. He reflects the more recent appreciation that panegyric is a type of literature of the first interest for historians studying emperors, rather than a hideous embarrassment. Chapter 11 also deals with an idealising form of literature, hagiography. Oscar Prieto Domínguez analyses how the image of the ‘iconoclast’ emperor Theophilos transitioned from one of heretic to saint in hagiography. Effectively the emperor’s reputation was rescued through the dynastic impetus of his widow, the empress Theodora, who was acting as regent for their young son Michael III. Prieto Domínguez also emphasises that empress saints have received a great deal of study while emperor saints have not, reinforcing the observation that emperors have been neglected as a subject compared to empresses. Chapter 12 deals with one of the most famous of Byzantine texts – one that features in several chapters in the volume (Chapters 2, 15, 16) – the Book of Ceremonies. Prerona Prasad analyses its prefaces to understand the project of the Macedonian Constantine VII to re-establish his dynastic authority after the fall of the Lekapenids, who had pushed him into the shadows. Prasad highlights that in this restoration narrative there was a strong emphasis on paternal legacy within the Macedonian dynasty, Constantine looking back to the achievements of his father, Leo VI, and grandfather Basil I, and forward to the reign of his own son, Romanos II; for instance, Constantine also produced a work of advice on foreign affairs for Romanos II, the De administrando imperio. In Chapter 13 we return to issues of panegyric again, Nikolaos Chrissis analysing orations of Niketas Choniates written at the court in Nicaea under Theodore I Laskaris, after the fall of Constantinople in 1204 to the Fourth Crusade. Choniates of course is best known for his History, and Chrissis shows how the orations reflect similar ideas to the critical ones found there, despite the orations ostensibly being vehicles to present the ideology of the Nicaean court. Like Vanderspoel, Chrissis argues that the orations are not mere flattery but can
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provide advice for the emperor, and can suggest ‘a political programme’ to him. In Chapter 14 we move further into the late empire, and come face to face with an emperor who was also an historian, John Kantazkouzenos, the author of the ‘only surviving history compiled by a Roman emperor’. Savvas Kyriakidis provides a wide-ranging analysis of the roles of a Byzantine emperor revealed in the history of John. For example, the chapter deals with the sacred character of the imperial office, the virtues emperors were expected to display, imperial ideology, issues of legitimacy and dynastic rights, the ceremonial role of the emperor, the rite of coronation, succession, the role and organisation of co-emperors, the military duties of the emperor, and relations with officials. Kyriakidis also emphasises the contrast between ideal and reality, reflecting on how the empire had changed by the time of the later empire. He observes in his conclusion that ‘Kantakouzenos strives to paint a traditional portrait of the emperor which seems to ignore political and cultural changes. However, the History cannot conceal the fact that political and military realities prompted important changes in the function and prestige of the imperial office’.

The final section, Part V: The material emperor: Image, space and empire, consists of three chapters, focusing on emperors and material culture. At the Symposium this section also included a paper by Eurydike Georganteli on the emperor and coinage. Regrettably this paper was not able to be included in the volume but there is coverage of coinage in this section in Mark Redknap’s chapter, based on his public lecture for the Symposium. Further, in Part I, Humphreys’ chapter includes discussion of the coinage of the Heraclian dynasty. In Chapter 15 Alicia Walker focuses on some of the most famous images of Byzantine emperors, the imperial mosaics in Hagia Sophia, especially the much-discussed image of the emperor in proskynesis before an enthroned Christ in the lunette above the Imperial Door, an image commonly associated with Leo VI. Walker combines her analysis of the images in Hagia Sophia with consideration of imperial ceremony conducted within the church, following the movements of the emperor as described in the Book of Ceremonies. The Great Church was the ‘site for the meeting of imperial and ecclesiastical authority’, and Walker comments on the sacred identity the emperor could acquire during these ceremonies. She asserts that in the mosaic above the Imperial Door the emperor is depicted ‘in an ambiguous state, as both the all-powerful earthly ruler and the all-humble subject of Christ. He is shown as a privileged witness of theophany and as a high-ranking member of the heavenly court’. In Chapter 16 Lynn Jones is also concerned with ceremony, in the setting of the palace. She focuses in particular on the ‘campaign palace’, the location of the emperor when he was on the road, away from Constantinople. She emphasises the organisation of the staging of formal audiences with the emperor, and the portability of the objects used for such occasions, not just on campaign but within the Great Palace itself in Constantinople. She argues that ‘we [should] broaden the definition of palace, and privilege function over buildings’. Once again we think about the relationship between emperors and non-Byzantines, and Jones describes palaces as ‘stages, on which the wealth and power of the empire was displayed’.
In the final chapter, Chapter 17, Mark Redknap is also concerned with the relationship of the emperor and empire with the outside world. Through a range of archaeological evidence, he explores Byzantium’s connections – ‘perceived or real’ – with Britain, and Wales in particular. Inscriptions, coins, pots, luxury items such as metal work and silks, all come under consideration, as do the people themselves. In addition, Redknap considers Welsh collections and collectors. Of particular interest is the significant coin collection of the National Museum Wales itself, and Redknap analyses the depiction of emperors on this coinage. Given that the Symposium took place in Wales for the first time, Redknap’s chapter forms a fitting conclusion to the volume, illustrating both Welsh historical connections with, and continued interest in, Byzantium.

Having provided an overview of the chapters some final thoughts on the volume as a whole are in order. As already noted, many of the chapters cut across the imposed subject divisions, expanding the coverage of the chosen subjects. As also noted above, the volume does not aspire to completeness, an impossible task in such a volume anyway. Other aspects of emperors could have been addressed, some of these pointed to by the volume itself. Despite the desire to give emperors as much attention as empresses, it is clear that empresses need to be discussed too in relation to their male counterparts, given for instance the significance of Constantinian women highlighted by Humphries, and the Amorian Theodora by Prieto Domínguez. It would have been interesting to consider gender further too, for instance in relation to both Pulcheria and Basil II not getting married. Byzantinists do not agonise over the fact that imperial women might not get married; this surely tells us something about gender attitudes within Byzantium as well as the gender attitudes of those who study it. No one, to my knowledge, has suggested that Pulcheria had same-sex desires. Ceremonial features strongly in the volume, and certain rituals merit more attention, such as coronation, which was touched on by Kyriakidis. The court setting and personnel of the emperor is also an important subject and could have received further attention; for instance, the volume features no discussion of the emperor’s relationship with eunuchs, ironically enough, though Basil the parakoimomenos does surface in relation to the key manuscript of the Book of Cermonies as well as his role in the reign of his great-nephew Basil II. The possible role of the emperor as author does appear in the volume, but could have been discussed further. On the other hand, many of these aspects are familiar ones and can be accessed elsewhere. More significant is that the volume features some key running themes. Dynasty, unsurprisingly, is a particular thread, and chimes with the recent notable increased interest in this aspect of emperors. Likewise, ideals of rulership come to the fore: the political, military and religious roles the emperor was expected to play feature in many of the chapters. Above all, the volume deals time and again with images of emperors – textual and visual – rather than necessarily emperors of flesh and blood. Byzantium was saturated with the idea of the emperor, conscious of its identity as the Roman empire. As such, the emperor is a subject that deserves and requires further detailed attention. It is hoped that this volume will both encourage and assist this.
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Notes
1 James 2001: ix.
5 See also Tougher 2010.
7 Hopkins 1978: 186, observed in his review, ‘The book is called The Emperor in the Roman World and yet I get from it no feeling of what it was like to be emperor, none of their hopes, ambitions, fears’.
12 See for instance Baker-Brian and Tougher, eds. 2012, on Julian as emperor and author.
13 For instance, on the Byzantine court see Maguire, ed. 1997.
14 Witness, for instance, Duindam 2016, and the workshop on ‘Medieval Dynasties’ held at the University of Birmingham from 25 to 26 May 2018.

Chapter 1

1 I am grateful to Shaun Tougher for his invitation to address the Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies and, subsequently, to contribute to this volume. In Cardiff the paper benefited from discussion with the participants, particularly Meaghan McEvoy and John Vanderspoel. An anonymous referee offered a chastening report, highlighting my embarrassing blind-spots, and I hope to have addressed their concerns. None of those mentioned are responsible for the flaws that remain.
2 The basic chronological details (and sources) can be found in Kienast 1996: 314–317, 323–329.
3 On the mood of the time, see Amm. Marc. 26.1.3: Hac volubilium casuum diritate exitu luctuoso finita, obiture intervallato trium brevi tempore principum.
4 Amm. Marc. 26.1.7; 26.2.1.
5 Amm. Marc. 26.2.3–4. For this sequence of events, see Lenski 2002: 21–25.
6 This much is clear from Dagalaifus’ interjection, and from Valentine’s angry response to it: Amm. Marc. 26.4.1–2; cf. den Boeft, Drijvers, den Hengst, and Teitler 2007: 78–79.
7 Amm. Marc. 26.4.1: Dagalaifus tunc equestris militiae rector respondit fidentius ‘si tuos amas, inquit, imperator optime, habes fratrem, si rem publicam, quaere quem vestigas.’
8 Leo Gramm., Chron.: 97; Cedrenus, Chron. 1.541. The suggestion of Bleckmann 1995: 89–91, that the common source is the lost Annales of Nicomachus Flavianus seems unlikely: for a discussion of the Byzantine tradition, see Cameron 2011: 659–665. See also den Boeft, Drijvers, den Hengst, and Teitler 2007: 78–79.
9 The most recent overview of the whole subject is Hekster 2015.
10 A good example is provided by Suet., Dom. 23.1, indicating the different responses to the murder of Domitian by the senate and people of Rome (who welcomed it) and the troops (who demanded vengeance on the assassins).
11 Cf. Börm 2015: while I concur with him that the Constantinian period saw renewed emphasis on dynastic succession, I would see it as having been more important throughout the Principate than he does.
13 Res Gestae Divi Augusti 6.1; 34.3.
15 Börm 2015: 240. This circumstance might render plausible the public display of hesi-
tation attributed by Velleius Paterculus 2.124.2 to Tiberius when he was offered the
position of princeps in AD 14.
17 Horster 2011.
18 Cic., ad Atticum 14.12.2.
20 For the basic principles, see Hekster 2015: 2–25.
21 Tac., Hist. 1.16.
22 Brunt 1977: 100 n. 27.
24 Horster 2011: 94.
25 For the complexities of Trajan’s succession to Nerva, see Hekster 2014.
28 HA Hadrian 27.2.
30 Dio 71.36.3–4.
31 Appian, Bell. Civ. 1.5.
32 The classic statement of this reality comes in Septimius Severus’ dying instructions
to his sons that they ‘be harmonious, enrich the troops, and despise all the rest’ (Dio
76.15.2); cf. the cautious analysis of Campbell 1984: 401–414.
33 Dio 75.3–5.
35 Herodian 5.1.6–7.
speech described by Herodian 5.1.8 in which Macrinus condemns dynastic successors
like Commodus and Caracalla, he still vows to behave like Marcus Aurelius or Pertinax.
37 For the date: Brunt 1977: 104–105.
38 See Suet., Vesp. 9.
40 Tac., Hist. 4.40.1; but the mood seems to have turned against Galba at a later date:
41 Thus Alexander Severus in 233: licet enim lex imperii sollemnibus iuris imperatorem
solverit, nihil tamen tam proprium imperii est, ut legibus vivere (Cod. Just. 6.23.3).
42 Ulpian: Dig. 1.4.1 pr.: quod principi placuit, legis habet vigorem; for the context:
43 Aur. Vict., Caes. 37.5–7, traces the change to Tacitus’ elevation in 276: Abhinc militaris poten-
tia convaluit ac senatui imperium creandique ius principis ereptum ad nostram memoriam.
44 See especially Horster 2007: 296–303, for numismatic evidence for dynastic asser-
tions in the third century.
45 Ando 2000: 207.
46 Dexippus FGrH 100 F 24.
47 Pan. Lat. 10(2).9.3: quod omni consanguinitate certius est, virtutibus fratres.
48 For Theodora and Maximian’s complex marital history, see Barnes 1982: 33–34.
49 Barnes 2011: 46–49.
51 For the explicitly dynastic aspirations here, see Pan. Lat. 7(6).2.2 and 2.5, with Börm
2015: 247.
52 *Pan. Lat.* 6(7).2.5: *quod imperator es <natus>.*
55 Barnes 2011: 146–150.
56 Burgess 2008.
57 Eus., *VC* 4.51–2.
58 These problems are neatly delineated by Börm 2015: 251–254.
59 Humphries 1997.
60 See Humphries forthcoming.
61 Woods 2004 offers a summary; for more detail (albeit some of it speculative) see Chausson 2007.
62 Croke 2010: 249.
66 Holum 1982: 28–44.
67 Julian, *Or.* 1.6d; 2.51c.
68 Börm 2015: 257.
70 *PLRE* 1: 221, Constantia 2.
71 The reign of Jovian might be too short to see any efforts at dynasty building (Börm 2015: 257), although the designation of his infant son Varronianus as *consul ordinarius* in 364 perhaps hints at the germ of a plan.
72 McEvoy 2013: 48–53.
73 For the succession to Valentinian I, see Kelly 2013.
74 Symm., *Or.* 9.3; 43.2.
75 Zos. 4.44.1–4; analysis in McLynn 1994: 292–293.
77 Chausson 2007: 166, fig. 18.
79 For what follows, see McEvoy 2013.
80 Constantine II was only a few months old when he was made Caesar in 317, and just 20 at his accession as Augustus in 337 (*PLRE* 1: 223, Constantius 3); Constantius was born in 317, became Caesar at 7 in 324, and was 19 on the death of his father (*PLRE* 1: 226, Constantius 8). Constans was likely only 13 when proclaimed Caesar in 333, and 17 in 337 (*PLRE* 1: 220, Constans 3).
82 Humphries 2012: 173.
83 For Galla Placidia, see most recently Sivan 2011: 86–93. On Theodosian women more generally, Connor 2004: 45–72, offers a good overview; Holum 1982 discusses the issue in detail.
84 Hydatius, *Chron.* 155 Burgess = 162 Mommsen.
85 MacGeorge 2002.
86 Börm 2015: 259–262.

**Chapter 2**

1 Shepard (ed.) 2008: 906.
2 For the topic of dynasty in Byzantium see Dagron 2003: 13–53. For Byzantine political thought and ideology that framed the imperial office see also: Dvornik 1966; Runciman 1977; Nicol 1988; and Kaldellis 2015.
For instance, Dagron 2003: 13–14, notes that a seventh/eighth-century Chinese traveler and a ninth-century Khazar envoy both mentioned the rapid turnover of emperors and dynasties so at odds with their own societies.

For the influence of Pulcheria and other female members of the Theodosian family, see Holm 1982.

Michael Psellos, Chronographia 5.17–51.

For imperial women in general, see Garland 1999; Herrin 2001.

Dagron 2003: 32.


De cer. 1.42, 2.21–22.

McEvoy 2013.


Theophanes, Chronographia AM 6268.


In the period 610–1204, 32 co-emperors succeeded of whom 25 were offspring. 21 took power violently. The Palaiologans shift the statistics firmly in the direction of family.

For the period in general see Stratos 1968–80; Haldon 1997; Howard-Johnston 2010; and Sarris 2011: 226–306. For a discussion of many of the same themes surrounding dynasty, ideology and uses of the imperial past in the seventh century, see Haldon 1994.

Indeed, seventh-century Byzantium is almost coterminous with the Heraclians. For instance, Stratos 1968–80 explicitly ends with the death of the last Heraclians.


Namely Heraclius; his sons Heraclius Constantine, Heraclonas and David; his grandson Constans II; his great-grandson Constantine IV and his brothers Heraclius and Tiberius; and finally Justinian II and his son Tiberius.

In general see Kaegi 2003; Reinink and Stolte (eds.) 2002.

For the dating of Constans II's assassination to 669 and its general significance see Howard-Johnston 2010: 126, 235–236, 491. For a defence of the 668 date, see Jankowiak 2013: 307–309.

For the challenges faced by Heraclius in the early years of his reign and his prominent use of his children see Kaegi 2003: 58–99.

Treadgold 2013: 1–37.

By far the most common occasion for multiple generations of the Heraclian family to be mentioned at the same moment is during a succession, and then usually an emperor is referred to simply as the son of his predecessor, with no further elaboration given. The only regular mention of any additional antecessor is when Constans II became emperor in 641, when several sources explicitly state that Constans was the grandson of Heraclius and the son of Heraclius Constantine; see inter alia Theophanes, AM 6133. The complex sequence of emperors in 641, and the tangled family politics, would be enough to warrant such clarification, though it also seems highly plausible that from the inception of his reign Constans II was presented as the legitimate descendent of Heraclius, unlike Heraclonas who was born of the incestuous marriage to Martina.

Nicephorus, History 40.


Nicephorus, History 42, 103.


Zuckermann 2010: 889.
For the huge importance of ceremonial to Byzantine emperors, in which all those associated with imperial power would have been included, see Dagron 2003: 54–124.

A point I owe to Simon Corcoran.

34 Respectively Justin I and Justinian I, Justin II and Tiberius II, and Tiberius II and Maurice. Tiberius II was also Caesar to the insane Justin II 574–78.

35 PLRE 3, Theodosius 13.

36 John of Ephesus, History 3.5.14


40 Kaegi 2003: 53.

41 PLRE 3, Nicetas 7; PLRE 3, Gregoria.


43 PLRE 3, Heraclius Constantinus 38

44 PLRE 3, Epiphania quae et Eudocia 2


47 Nicephorus, History 10. For Heraclius’ campaigns from 624 see Howard-Johnston 1999.

48 For the poor health of Heraclius Constantine see Kaegi 2003: 238.

49 PLRE 3, Fabius, Theodosius 44; Nicephorus, History 11; see also the commentary of Mango 1990: 179–180, for his preference for Fabius. Although ineligible for the throne, Heraclius still made use of Theodosius by marrying him to the daughter of the Persian general Shahvaraz as part of the bargain by which the Persian army evacuated Egypt and Heraclius supported Shahvaraz’s bid for the Persian throne. This was not the only arranged marriage alliance, as Epiphania was betrothed to the Turkish Khan. For Heraclius’ use of his children for marriage alliances, see Kaegi 2003: 188–191.

50 PLRE 3, Heraclonas, David 8, Marinus 12. Pace the PLRE I prefer Martinus to Marinus given that it is the name used in both Nicephorus and the De cerimonii.

51 Theophanes AM 6108. We can be certain of the date thanks to a dating formula in a papal letter from 634, see Jaffé et al. (eds.) 1885–88: 2018.

52 De cer. 2.27; trans. Moffatt and Tall 2012, vol. 2: 628.

53 De cer. 2.29. PLRE 3, Augustina, Martina 2.

54 Nicephorus, History 27. While this has been doubted by some, Zuckermann 2010: 875, demonstrates through a formula preserved in an Egyptian papyrus that Martinus was definitely made a Caesar in 639.


56 PmbZ 1: 7797; Zuckermann 2010: 870. Zuckermann believes that the anonymous nobilissimus named in the formula was the similarly unnamed son of Heraclius who in John of Nikiu, Chronicle 120, was castrated during the downfall of Martina and Heraclonas. While possible, this youth is nowhere else mentioned, and could anyway refer to Martinus. Moreover, if this was another son of Heraclius, why does no nobilissimus appear in the imperial college of Heraclonas? Lastly, it seems that Theodosius, who is only mentioned in the sources joining his brother at the battle of Phoenix in 654 and being killed by him in 659/660, must have had some imperial title at some point to warrant Constans’ fear of him being sufficient to court public disapproval by having him killed.

57 Nicephorus, History 27.

58 Zuckermann 2010: 875.

59 Nicephorus, History 31.
60 Nicephorus, *History* 32.
61 According to Theophanes AM 6134, on his accession as sole emperor Constans addressed the senate stressing his descent from the long-ruling Heraclius and Heraclius Constantine, while denigrating Martina and her incestuous offspring.
62 *PmbZ* 1: 3702. We know the date thanks to the regnal years recorded for Constantine IV, Heraclius and Tiberius in the *Acta* of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, Riedinger (ed.) 1990–95.
63 Hoyland 2011: 143–144.
64 *PmbZ* 1: 2556, 8484.
65 Theophanes AM 6161. In the Syriac sources the opposition on the grounds that the Trinity in heaven should be reflected by a Trinity on earth is voiced by a lone senator, see Hoyland 2011: 173–174. For the deposition of Constantine IV’s brothers see Haldon 1997: 68–69.
67 For instance, Justinian’s name does not appear in Constantine IV’s edict enforcing the Sixth Ecumenical Council, Riedinger (ed.) 1990–95: 832–857, and Justinian’s reign is counted from 685 in a letter he sent to the pope declaring his support for that council, Riedinger (ed.) 1990–95: 886–887.
68 *PLRE* 3, Mauricius 4.
69 Dagron 2003: 27.
70 For Heraclius the Elder, Heraclius’ father, see *PLRE* 3, Heraclius 3.
71 Respectively *PmbZ* 1: 2556, 2557.
72 For this brief moment of celebration see Kaegi 2003: 192–228.
73 For the significance of names, or more precisely the limited significance of imperial names, see Haldon 1994: 104–106.
74 Nicephorus, *History* 32.
75 *De cer.* 2.29; for Constantine IV’s wife see *PmbZ* 1: 228.
76 *PmbZ* 1: 6119.
77 *PmbZ* 1: 7282.
78 For the importance of Constantine I for later Byzantine emperors see Magdalino (ed.) 1994.
79 *PLRE* 3, Tiberius 1.
80 For instance, in Jaffé *et al.* (eds.) 1885–88: 2018, from 634 he is only called Constantine, whereas in 2001, from 613, and 2016, from 628, he is called Heraclius Constantine. For the coins see *DOC* 2.2: 385–388.
81 *DOC* 2.2: 389–401.
82 Haldon 1994: 104.
83 *PLRE* 3, Iustinianus 4.
84 *PmbZ* 1: 3556.
85 See n. 23.
86 For the context see Howard-Johnston 2010: 488–495.
87 *Liber Pontificalis* 83.3.
88 On the iconography of Heraclian coinage, and on imperial iconography on coinage in general, see also the remarks of Mark Redknap in this volume.
89 *DOC* 2.1, Heraclius solidus I; follis I.
90 *DOC* 2.1, Heraclius solidus II; follis II.
91 *DOC* 2.1: 88–94.
92 *DOC* 2.1, Heraclius solidus III–IV; follis V–VI.
93 *DOC* 2.1: 115–116.
94 In particular compare *DOC* 2.2, Constans solidus IV with *DOC* 2.1, Heraclius solidus III.
95 *DOC* 2.2, Constans II solidus III–VII; follis V–XI.
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96 DOC 2.2, Constans II solidus V–VII; the reverse of VII cf. the obverse of DOC 2.1, Heraclius solidus IV.
97 DOC 2.2, Constans II follis, I–VII.
98 DOC 2.2, Constantine IV solidus II–III. This and other examples in Roman/Byzantine numismatic history demonstrate that either some kind of archive of coin types must have been kept in the Constantinopolitan mint, or that old coins continued in circulation long enough that older iconographies could be resurrected. For the link between Constantine IV’s return to a Justinianic iconography and his naming of his son Justinian, see Morrisson 1970: 374.
100 DOC 2.2, Constantine IV solidus IV.
101 DOC 2.2, Justinian II (first reign) solidus I–II, (second reign) solidus II.
102 For the significance of Justinian II’s coins, see Breckenridge 1959. For a dating of the Christ coinage to 690, see Humphreys 2013: 229–244.
103 DOS VI: 12–21.
104 DOS VI: 22.
105 DOS VI: 23–24.
107 For a discussion of this question and the potential impact coins could make on their audience, see Morrisson 2013.
108 Cosentino 2014.
109 Parastaseis 61.
110 Parastaseis 37; commentary in Cameron and Herrin 1984: 210–212.
111 For David in particular, see Spain Alexander 1977. For the rise in the general importance of the Old Testament in late antique imperial rhetoric peaking under Heraclius, see Rapp 2010.
112 For the Melchizidek comparison, see Dagron 2003: 170–173.
114 Justinian was mentioned 24 times at the council. In comparison, Constantine was mentioned only thrice. Constantine IV was hailed as a new Marcian and a new Justinian on four occasions (Riedinger (ed.) 1990–95: 210.15–19; 702.9–12; 750.3–5; 798.10–11), at the first two of which he was also hailed as a new Theodosius, and only at the first as a new Constantine. Not only was the memory of Constantine I a marginal presence at the Sixth Ecumenical Council, it was a memory that grew fainter over the course of its sessions.
115 The Council in Trullo, ed. Ohme 2006. For this council and its ideological importance, including Justinian II’s positioning of himself vis-à-vis Constantine IV and Justinian I, see Humphreys 2015: 37–80.
118 Ostrogorsky 1968: 128–129. Ostrogorsky was engaged in a debate over what title really signified who had power within the imperial college, and strongly argued for the importance of autokrator, the Greek equivalent of imperator. For this debate and a cogent criticism of this search for a monarchical concept behind the various titles given to members of the imperial college, see Zuckermann 2010: 885–890.
120 Literally so in the case of the ceremonies of 638–639 preserved in De cer. 2.27–29. The similarities with Basil I and his sons should also be noted; see Dagron 2003: 33–35.
Chapter 3

I thank Shaun Tougher for the opportunity to speak and write on Basil II and for his understanding and guidance. I also thank Stephanie Cobb, Derek Krueger, Nancy Rabinowitz, and Steven Smith for their advice.

All translations are my own.

His brother, Constantine VIII (1025–1028), was also emperor throughout this time, but all sources agree that he was side-lined until Basil’s death: see for instance Tougher 2013: esp.316–318. Be it noted that Constantine married.


For a classic statement of Basil’s success, see Ostrogorsky 1968. Others, e.g. Angold 1997 and Holmes 2005, are sceptical to varying degrees, wondering if the success of the empire under Basil was as solid as it has sometimes been made out to be. See Holmes 2005: 448–543, for narration of his reign, including the major campaigns. For legal enactments, see Svoronos 1994: 185–217. I should note here too that Holmes 2003 and 2005 and Sifonas 1994 have provided welcome nuance to overly schematized accounts of Basil’s reign that see him as relentlessly attacking the aristocracy as a whole, for he opposed some families and not others.


E.g. Garland 1999a: 321, states that the question of Basil’s non-marriage has been (close to?) a non-issue since 1975: ‘A study by Arbagi (1975) has helped resolve the problem of why Basil never married.’

*Chronographia* 1.4: ἀπαρακαλύπτως ἐκώμαζε καὶ θαμὰ ἤρα.

*Chronographia* 1.4: ὅλοις ἱστίοις ἀπενεχθεὶς τῆς τρυφῆς, ὅλῳ πνεύματι ἀντείχετο τῆς σπουδῆς.

*Chronographia* 1.17: τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐκτεμόντες τῷ Βασιλείῳ προσάγουσι.

*Chronographia* 1.32; Crostini 1996 shows that Psellos is being particularly tendentious here.

*Chronographia* 1.28: ὁ δὲ ἄρα οὐ στρατηγικὴν βουλὴν, ἀλλὰ πανοῦργον εἰσηγεῖται γνώμην . . . γυναῖκα τε εἰς τὰ βασίλεια μὴ εἰσαγαγεῖν. . .

It is possible that a reader may think this translation is not correct and that Skleros merely counsels against having a woman at imperial strategy sessions, as Sewter in his translation from 1979 seems to believe. This, however, is to understand the passage in an unnecessarily laboured way. The passage’s probable reference to advice to Basil to persist in his bachelorhood is strongly supported by reference to the *LSJ*. We read the following, which is as close to conclusive as can be imagined, at εἰσάγω: ‘εἰσαγαγεῖν or ἐσαγαγέσθαι γυναῖκα to lead a wife into one’s house, Hdt. 5.40, 6.63’. The reference to Herodotus seals the deal, as Psellos’ audience was cultivated. Furthermore, *ta basileia* was a favoured term for ‘palace’ from early times in Greek, and again this meaning would be a predominant one if we allow the fact
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of Psellos’ audience’s cultivation its proper weight. For the record, this passage has not been mentioned in any scholarship that I have seen that has addressed Basil’s bachelorhood.


22 Holmes 2003: 61, is the less direct; Holmes 2005: 34, is the more direct.

23 Holmes 2005.

24 Holmes 2005: 463–470, argues persuasively that understanding Basil as opposed to all the aristocratic families, full-stop, is incorrect. It was rather the case that he was against some families and a key issue in the maintenance of his authority was not so much land and revenue as control of the army (cf. Holmes 2003: 48–51, and Sifonas 1994).

25 Note that Psellos offers elsewhere a brief sketch of Basil’s grim character: Historia Syntomos 106.


28 Chronographia 1.4.


30 Tougher 2013: 307, ‘It seems likely that his decision was taken on religious grounds, rather than because of sexual preference, but the fact remains that this was a highly unusual act for a ruler. . .’; cf. Crostini 1996: 76–77.

31 Arbagi 1975; Garland 1999a: 321; Holmes twice reports that others have seen a vow by Basil as an explanation for his failure to wed (Holmes 2006: 336; 2005: 45 n.60). Magdalino 2003: 263–265, suggests that Basil’s bachelorhood and religious interests be associated with general feelings in the empire that the millennium was going to bring with it the end of the world; he was unmarried because the end of days was nigh.

32 Crostini 1996: 74–75 (speaking of Chronographia 1.18): ‘[at this point in the Chronographia, Psellos only means to speak of] the emperor’s zealous undertaking of duty, his business of governing of the state. No fanciful dedication to a religious lifestyle is here implied’. In spite of this, Crostini 1996: 76–77, believes that Psellos elsewhere (at Chronographia 1.32) implies that Basil was acting according to religious scruples when his behaviour changed from fun-loving to grim. She even calls it a ‘religious conversion’ (76). The narrative of Psellos is complex and Crostini perhaps argues against herself here.

33 Chronographia 1.28.

34 For background on Ademarus, see Wolff 1978: esp. 139.


36 Among the errors are the omission of the Battle of Kleidion, misconceptions about the personnel of the Bulgarian leadership, and the belief that Basil’s struggles with the Bulgarians began around the year 1000 (they began in the 980s). For discussion of Ademarus’ mistakes, see Arbagi 1975: 43–44, and Wolff 1978: 143–144.
37 *Chronicon* 3.32: [B]asilius imperator super eos nīmis irritatus, voto se obligavit Deo monachum fieri, si Grecis gentem Bulgarorum subderet . . . sicut voto promiserat, habitum monasticum greca figura subterindutus in reliquum est omni vitae sueae tempore, a voluptate et carnibus abstinens, et imperiali scemate extrinsecus circumdabatur.

38 Arbagi 1975: 44.

39 As noted above, Wolff believes that the severe and ascetic Basil’s vow was fictitious.


41 Tougher 2013: 307, remarks that there was one other emperor who did not wed: Constans I (337–350), son of Constantine I. It is interesting to note in the context of the present investigation that there was discussion in the sources about Constans’ interest in same-sex encounters. See my discussion, with bibliography: Masterson 2014: 24 n.53.

42 Psellos, *Chronographia* 1.28.


45 *Catecheses* 22.24–28: '[He (=I) had] a young man’s beauty and possessed frame, personality, and gait that were like a vision, so that from these [aspects] some even had raunchy suspicions about him, and others were only looking at his outer aspects and were judging him basely as regards other things. . .’ (. . .ὡραῖος τῷ εἴδει καὶ φαντασιῶδες τὸ τε σχῆμα καὶ τὸ ἦθος καὶ τὸ βάδισμα κεκτημένος, ὡς ἐκ τούτων καὶ ὑπολήψεις πονηρὰς ἔχειν τινὰς εἰς αὐτὸν, τοὺς τὸ ἔξωθεν μόνον βλέποντας περικάλυμμα καὶ κακῶς κρίνοντας τὰ ἄλλοτρα. . .).

46 See comment by McGuckin 1996: 19, ‘a successful and somewhat rakish youth’.

47 Darrouzès 1966: 8–13, provides a tidy presentation of the contentious atmosphere that most likely surrounded Symeon when he wrote the *Orationes Ethicae*.

48 Niketas Stethatos, *Vita Symeonis* 59. Note that Niketas depicts Symeon as resigning from his leadership role voluntarily on account of his love of quiet (ὁ ἔρως τῆς ἡσυχίας). To see this incident (and others from Niketas’ life) as suggesting him losing the monastery involves reading through panegyrical content (a necessary if precarious operation). At the moment I follow Turner 1990: 34.

49 Niketas Stethatos, *Vita Symeonis* 72.


51 Niketas Stethatos, *Vita Symeonis* 95.

52 Niketas Stethatos, *Vita Symeonis* 100.

53 See Messis 2014: 145–146, for a chronology that places Symeon’s travails a decade or so earlier.

54 Krueger’s suggestion (2006: 100) that the parable might recall the political situation in Basil’s reign was an important inspiration for this chapter. I will note here that Krueger’s goal diverges from mine. Krueger argues that the carnality between emperor and rebel be seen in the context of Symeon’s interest in guiding the ascetic practices of his monks with lively and likely imagery; the evocation of homoerotic desire ‘is a powerful tool in the making of his monks’ (Krueger 2006: 118). It is my hope that my analysis be seen as complementary to his.


56 *Oratio Ethica* 10.646.
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63 Χλανίδιον is the Greek translation of *paludamentum*, which is the emperor’s cloak (*LSJ*, χλανίδιον).


65 See Krueger 2006: 101, on the anxiety this passage has awakened in some of Symeon’s modern commentators.


69 ἐτεὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος εἶδεν αὐτόν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη καὶ δραμὼν ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν.

70 Niketas Stethatos, *Vita Symeonis* 34, mentions that St. Mamas was founded by Maurice when he discusses Symeon’s renovations to the monastery.

71 *PG* 89: 1112–1116. This work exists in two nearly identical versions. The parable can also be found at *PG* 89: 1140–1142. I limit my discussion to the first version.

72 Anastasius of Sinai, *Oratio in Psalmum VI* [*PG* 89: 1116A]): Ἠκούσαμεν λῃστὴν σωθέντα δι' ἐξομολογήσεως ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ οὐρανίου βασιλέως, καὶ ἐκδόμεν ἐξομολογήσεως ἐπὶ τῆς σῆς βασιλείας.

73 The coming remarks on various loci in Symeon’s works owe much to Krueger’s discussion from 2006.

74 *Hymn* 24.74–75: γέγονα, οἴμοι, καὶ μοιχὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ / καὶ σοδομίτης ἔργῳ καὶ προαιρέσει.

75 *Hymn* 24.175–177: πῶς γὰρ δυναίμην σιωπῇ ὑποφέρειν / τὰ γινόμενα καθ’ ὥραν, ὦ θεέ μου, / καὶ πραττόμενα ἐν ἐμοὶ τῷ ἀθλίῳ.

76 *Hymn* 24.76: γέγονα πόρνος, μάγος καὶ παιδοφθόρος.


80 *Oratio Ethica* 10.304–311: Τοιγαροῦν, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί, πάντα ἀφεντες μὴ ἀφίζεσθε δράμωμεν γυμνοὶ, καὶ προσελθόντες τῷ δεσπότῃ Χριστῷ προσψέσθωμεν καὶ προσκλαίσθωμεν ἐνόπιον τῆς αὐτοῦ αγαθότητος, ἵνα καὶ αὐτὸς, θεασάμενος τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν ἡμῶν, ὁμοίως ἡμᾶς, μᾶλλον δὲ μειζόνως, ἀποδέξηται καὶ
καὶ διαδήματι τῷ ἑαυτοῦ κατακοσμήσῃ καὶ ἀξίους τοῦ ἐπουρανίου νυμφῶνος δαιτυμόνας ἐργάσηται. Cf. Oratio Ethica 10.274–278, and Krueger 2006: 107. Note that Krueger and I see the nudity differently: for Krueger the nudity describes the casting off of desire, for me the nudity is revelation of desire.

82 Laiou 1992: 78.
83 Prefiguring this comment, Mullett 1988: 11 n.41, notes that possible sexual expression between men was not as weighty an issue as we now might imagine it was. Pitsakis 2008: 9, underscores the nonchalance in the sources about sex between men, while being uncertain whether this means that same-sex desire was thought unimportant or if there was wide-ranging tolerance that we, dealing with the weight of our history, can hardly understand now. Smythe 1999: 144, followed up Laiou’s analysis, but then speaks of Byzantium as the ‘first closet society’, citing Sedgwick 1990. As the closet in Sedgwick’s formulation is a structure of paranoid concealment with the possibility of catastrophic revelation, it does not suit this Byzantine evidence.

85 Messis 2006: 781.
87 Ὁ ἀσελγῆς δὲ τοὺς ποιῶν καὶ ὁ ὑπομένων ξίφει τιμωρείσθω· ὁ δὲ ἡττῶν τῶν δεκαπέντε ἐτῶν τυπτέσθω καὶ μοναστηρίῳ εἰσαγέσθω, ὡς τῆς ἡλικίας δελησίας τούτο άκουσίως πεπονθέναι αὐτὸν (ed. Simon and Troianos 1977: 71).
88 Οἱ ἀσελγεῖς, δὲ τοὺς ποιῶν καὶ ὁ πάσχων, ξίφει τιμωρείσθωσαν· εἰ μὴ ἀρα ὁ πεπονθὼς ἠλλιπτων ἡ τῶν β’ ἁρμόνιων. τότε γὰρ τὸ ἐνδεές τῆς ἡλικίας αὐτοῦ τῆς τωιστῆς αὐτοῦ ἔξαρσησθαι τοινης (eds. Zepos and Zepos 1931: 365).
89 Οἱ ἀσελγεῖς, δὲ τοὺς ποιῶν καὶ ὁ πάσχων, ξίφει τιμωρείσθωσαν· εἰ μὴ ἀρα ὁ πεπονθὼς ἠλλιπτων ἡ τῶν β’ ἁρμόνιων. τότε γὰρ τὸ ἐνδεές τῆς ἡλικίας αὐτοῦ τῆς τωιστῆς αὐτοῦ ἀπαλλάττει τοινης (Zepos and Zepos 1931: 225–226).
95 PG 99: 1728: εἰ δὲ ἀμελῇ, τὰ δεκαπέντε ἔτη ἐκτελείτω τὸ ἐπιτίμιον.
96 Arranz 1993: 20–22, who assembled an edition that contains two of the three canons to be discussed presently, attributes the collection to John the Monk and suggests that it could be as late as the eleventh century but prefers the ninth or early tenth, cf. Troianos 1989: 43, who does not believe the sixth-century patriarch wrote these canons either.
97 Troianos 1989: 43.
100 Arranz 1993: 72.9–12, elsewhere in these canons, and with possible inconsistency, sex against nature with a man (Arranz 1993: 68.10 and 14–15) nets simply a three-year penance with no qualification.
101 Messis 2006: 786; Arranz 1993: 70.8, 70.21–72.1.
102 Arranz 1993: 50.26–32.
103 Arranz 1993: 54.10–17: Περὶ ἀρσενοκοιτίας. Ἡ δὲ ἀρσενοκοιτία τρεῖς ἔχει τὰς διαφοράς. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ τὸ παθεῖν παρ᾽ ἑτέρων τὸ δέко κουφότερον ἢ διὰ τὴν ἀνηλικιότητα, ἢ διὰ πτωχείαν, ἢ διὰ βιαν, ἢ πολλὰς τὰς διαφοράς. Ἡ δὲ ποιῆσαι ὅ και βαρύτερον τὸ παθεῖν. Τὸ δὲ παρ᾽ ἑτέρων παθεῖν και ποιῆσαι εἰς ἑτέρων πάσης ἃν εἰη ἀπολογίας ἀλλότριον.
104 Morris 2016: 3, has the following to say about the impression the evolving attitudes of the medieval church can evoke: 'In terms of “gay sexuality,” the historical practice of the [Eastern Orthodox] church is far from what many modern church members might expect it to have been’.
105 For the dating of the life, see Talbot 1996: 242–245.
106 See Rapp 2016: 220–222, for discussion of this life. I also thank her for drawing my attention to this work.
107 Vita S. Mariae Iunioris 30/704: προσφιλὴς . . . αὐτοῖς.
108 Vita S. Mariae Iunioris 30/704: Ἐσχε καὶ συνασκητὴν καὶ συνεργὸν ἅπαντων τῶν καλλίστων κατορθωμάτων Θεόδωρόν τινα . . . ἄνδρα γενναῖον τὰ στρατιωτικὰ καὶ ρωμαλέον, γενναίατερον δὲ τοῖς κατὰ Θεόν πολιτεῖσθαι· ᾧ δὲ συμβεβηκές, οἷα κατὰ καιρὸν εὐφροσύνως ἠθέρισαν, καρποὺς ὀρίμως Θεῷ καὶ τοῖς θείοις ληνοῖς ἐναπέθεντο καὶ ἀγαλλίασιν αἰώνιον ἐκομίσαντο.
109 Vita S. Mariae Iunioris 31/704: κοιλιακῷ νοσήματι περιπίπτετι.
110 Vita S. Mariae Iunioris 2/692: ‘Επειδὴ, φησιν, ἐκ συνηθείας ἰσχυρῶς θεῖος ἀνδρῶν, οὕτως ἐκ συνηθείας ἀλλήλοις συνεκράθημέν τε καὶ συνεδέθημεν, δίκαιον ἥγημαι τὸν δεσμὸν τῆς ἀγάπης θεῖοτέρον ἀλλήλοις συνεκράθημέν τε καὶ συνεδέθημεν τοῖς κατὰ Θεόν πολιτεύμασι· ᾧ δὴ συζευχθείς, οἷα μόσχος εὐγενὴς καὶ ἰσχυρὸς, ὡς εἰς πίονα γῆν ἠροτρίων ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν τὰ σπέρματα ὡς ἄριστοι γεωργοὶ κατεβάλλοντο, οἳ κατὰ καιρὸν εὐφροσύνως ἠθέρισαν, καρποὺς ὀρίμως Θεῷ καὶ τοῖς θείοις ληνοῖς ἐναπέθεντο καὶ ἀγαλλίασιν αἰώνιον ἐκομίσαντο.
111 For the record, it was not good for Maria to have this man for a husband. Violent, Nikephoros beat Maria so badly (9/696) that she died from her injuries (10/696).
112 Talbot 1996: 256 n.52; LSJ offer up the following in its entry for συνηθεία: ‘sexual intercourse, X.Cyr.6.1.31 (v.l.); ἔχειν μετὰ γυναικός Plu.2.310e; πρὸς γυναῖκα Vett. Val.288.23’.
113 It strikes me that this life needs to take its place as a central text on modes of interpersonal connection in Byzantium. Men and women become connected in marriage and men become connected through marriage, even as their relations, one on one, feature emotional and corporeal intensity. The regrettable violence of Nikephoros is worth some thought too: is there something to be said about his possible primary connection to Bardas and a marriage that was an afterthought?
115 There were marriages that built a man’s authority within the empire, e.g. the marriage of Nikephoros II Phokas to Theophano, Romanos II’s widow, is one. The second marriage of Michael II, to be discussed below, qualifies. John I Tzimiskes’ marriage to the sister of Bardas Skleros, an important military commander who later revolted against Basil, provides still another example (Leo the Deacon, Historia 5.5, 6.11, 7.3; Skylitzes, Synopsis Historion, John I Tzimiskes, chap. 5). There also were marriages (or proposed marriages) of Byzantine notables to foreigners. Basil and his brother were betrothed to Bulgarian princesses (Leo the Deacon, Historia 5.3; Shepard 2003: 15; Tougher 2013: 307). In 1005–1006, Basil arranged the marriage of Maria Argyropoulina – sister of the later emperor, Romanos III Argyros (1028–1034) – to Giovanni Orseolo (the son of Peter II, Doge of Venice) for the purpose of alliance (Skylitzes, Synopsis Historion, Basil II and Constantine VIII, chap. 25; Wortley 2010: 325 n.135). One need hardly mention Anna, Basil’s sister, and her marriage to Vladimir of Kiev, or Theophano Skleraina’s to Otto II (see for example Shepard 2003).
For discussion of the legislative background of marriage in Byzantine society, see Laiou 1992: 9–58, and Pitsakis 2000. For marriage among elite Byzantines, see Macrides 1992, Shepard 2003, Schreiner 1991, and, quite ad rem as general background to this chapter on Basil and his non-marriage, Tougher 2013. There also were moves toward having male members of the imperial house marrying foreign royalty in the tenth century. For example, Romanos II, Basil’s father, was betrothed in 944 to Bertha, daughter of Hugh of Arles (Shepard 2003: 7). Basil II with some controversy married his sister Anna to Vladimir of Kiev: see discussion in Shepard 2003, and Tougher 2013. In any case the importance of marriage for the formation of connections that will enable familial flourishing, political power, and even alliances with foreign powers is clear enough from the histories of this time. Skylitzes’ Synopsis Historion positively coruscates with marriages: Nikephoros II Phokas, chap. 2; John I Tzimiskes, chaps. 5, 7, 8; Basil II and Constantine VIII, chaps. 2, 17, 24, 25, 44.

117 Treadgold 2013: 165, 179.
118 As suggested by Treadgold 2013: 176–179.
119 Theophanes Continuatus 2.24: ‘οὐ γάρ ἐστιν οἷον ἄνευ γυναικός’ φάσκειν ‘βασιλέα τε ζῆν καὶ τὰς ἡμετέρας στερεῖσθαι γαμετὰς δεσποίνης καὶ βασιλιλόδ’.  
120 There is a further complexity to this story. The author, no friend to Michael, says that Michael wanted it to look like he loved his deceased wife so much that he had to be compelled to remarry: ‘Αντὶ κατὰ τὸ πένθος ἄληστον ἑαυτῆς κατασχεῖν τῶν πολλῶν ὡς πένθος ἄληστον ἑαυτῆς’.
121 Theophanes Continuatus 2.24.
124 Skylitzes, Synopsis Historion, sole reign of Constantine VII, chap. 7, reports that her name, prior to the assumption of the grand name Theophano, was Anastaso and that her background was not lofty; Wortley 2010: 232 n.32. It is possible that she was not as low as all that, see discussion in Garland 1999b: 126–127, 270 n.3. In any case, though, she was not as lofty as a Skleraina.
125 Symeon the Logothete, Chronicon 131.32 (ed. Wahlgren 2006: 248); Eudokia Ingerina was at first mistress to Michael III. Empress Theodora (his mother) and the logothete Theoktistos thought her unsuitable for Michael, making him marry Eudokia Dekapolitissa instead. Notably though, Eudokia’s modest background and the unpromising beginning of her involvement in imperial circles did not stop her from becoming mother to the Macedonian dynasty.
126 Treadgold 1997: 519.
127 Schreiner 1991: 189, points out that in the ninth and tenth centuries beauty in an empress was often more important than lineage and, hence, alliance. Desire was, therefore, a possible consideration.
129 Leo the Deacon, Historia 2.10.
131 Psellos memorably relates the peaceful meeting Bardas Skleros and Basil had (Chronographia 1.28). Bardas Phokas died before he could have been forgiven by Basil (Psellos, Chronographia 1.16–17; Skylitzes, Synopsis Historion, Basil II and Constantine VIII, chap. 18) but it does not seem likely that he would have fared as well as Skleros did.

132 Skylitzes, Synopsis Historion, Basil II and Constantine VIII, chap. 16: ὃν οὗτος φιλοφρόνως ἄγαν δεξάμενος καὶ περιχαρῶς μάγιστρόν τε εὐθέως ἐτίμησε καὶ συμβούλῳ διὰ παντὸς ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις ἔχρητο . . . αὐτὸς δὲ τῆς ἔξοδον συμβουλής μονοθεικής· καὶ φιλῶν δεόμενος καὶ συνεργῶν ἐν ταῖς περιστάσεσι, τότε γνησίοις τὸν Ῥωμανὸν προσεδέξατο, ἄνδρα εἰδὼς ἑντρεχῆ καὶ δραστηρίου καὶ τὰ πολεμικά ἰκανότατον.

133 Psellos, Chronographia 1.17.

134 Leo the Deacon, Historia 10.9.

135 For more on Kalokyres Delphinas, see Talbot and Sullivan 2005: 216 n.87; Wortley 2010: 318 n.96.


137 Leo the Deacon, Historia 10.9: ἀνεσκολόπισε.


141 Niketas Stethatos, Vita Symeonis 59.

142 Niketas Stethatos, Vita Symeonis 72.

143 Niketas Stethatos, Vita Symeonis 75–77.

144 Turner 1990: 21; Krivochéine and Paramelle 1963: 250–251 n.1, and 381 n.1; indeed, Krivochéine (252) says: ‘En général, quand il parle des « rois terrestres », c’est presque toujours sans sympathie, quelquefois avec ironie et hostilité’.

145 Precise dating of individual Catecheses is not possible. They were directions to his monks and they date from the time when he was hegoumenos of St. Mamas, i.e. 980–1005 (Krivochéine and Paramelle 1963: 165).

146 Catecheses 2.107–109: Ανθρωποι μὲν γὰρ ἅπαντες σχεδὸν τοὺς ἁσθενεῖς καὶ πτωχοὺς ὡσπερ ἀποβδελύγονται καὶ βασιλεῖς ἐπίγειοι τοὺς ὀρθοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὁμολόγησαν, καὶ συνειρρυθμεῖται καὶ συνεργασίας τοῖς παρακαταλήκτησε καὶ αὐτὸ πρὸς τοὺς τοῖς πάσης ἔργους φαίνεται. . .

147 Catecheses 4.470–472: Ὡσεὶς γὰρ βασιλεῖς ἀκόμη τοῦ ὑπ’ αὐτόν στρατεύματος ἁσθενείς καὶ εὐχείρωτος τοῖς πάσης γίνεται καὶ οὐδὲ βασιλεῖς φαίνεται. . .


149 The date of the Capita Theologica is late in the decade of the 1000s, or even later than that (Darrouzès and Neyrand 1996: 10).

150 Capita Theologica 2.8.10–11: πρὸς ὤψιν πνευματικῆς θεωρίας . . . ἀνενεχθέντος.

151 Capita Theologica 2.8.7–9: μοναχὸς ὁ ἀληθῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ πραγμάτων ἀναχωρήσας.
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152 Capita Theologica 2.8.13–16: βλέπει γάρ άει τὴν χάριν τοῦ Πνεύματος τὴν περιλάμψοισαν αὐτόν, ἡς ἐνδύμα καλεῖται καὶ βασιλείας ὄλουργις, μᾶλλον δ’ ὅπερ αὐτὸς ἐστιν ο Χριστός, εἶπεν αὐτὸν οἱ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύοντες ἐπενδύονται.

153 Capita Theologica 2.8.1–7: Καθάπερ ὁ ἀπὸ πτωχείας ἐσχάτης ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀνενεχθείς, καὶ περιφανὲς ἀξίωμα στολήν τε παρ' αὐτοῦ λαμπρὰν ἐνδυθεὶς καὶ πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἱστασθείς, αὐτόν τε τὸν βασιλέα μετὰ πόθου ὁρᾷ καὶ ὡς εὐεργέτην ὑπεραγαπᾷ, τὴν στολὴν τε ἣν ἐνεδύσατο τρανῶς κατανοεῖ καὶ τὸ ἀξίωμα ἐπιγινώσκει καὶ τὸν δοθέντα αὐτῷ πλοῦτον ἐπίσταται... .

154 The fact that neither position has exclusive rights to ‘over-love’ puts the question to the assertion of Krueger 2006: 115, that the asymmetries asserted for ancient sexuality are operative in Byzantium.

155 Space will not allow discussion, but this picture of a courtier raised up by imperial interest recalls what Beck 1965 has to say about hetaireiai (gangs, comradeships). He discusses evidence in the chronicle of Theophanes Continuatus, and in other later histories, of groups of young men of obscure origin who make their way into association with imperial power, or even to the throne itself. These men are chosen for membership in these hetaireiai on the basis of shared interests in, say, hunting or horsemanship, and good looks (and hence possible same-sex desire) could be a factor leading to successful entry into a hetaireia (Beck 1965: 10; 16). Indeed, Beck 1965: 29, remarks ‘der Charakter dieser Hetairien ist nicht durchwegs politisch’. The rise of emperor Basil I (867–886) is a prime example of this mode of advancement. He was both a member of a hetaireia and then patron of one just before the assassination of his predecessor Michael III (Beck 1965: 4–18). His abilities and looks played a part in his rise. A hetaireia from the beginning of the ninth century supported by Bardanes Tourkos that contained the future emperors Leo V (813–820) and Michael II (820–829) provides still another example (Beck 1965: 18–22). Beck 1965: 28, perhaps goes too far when he emphasizes the extra-constitutional nature of hetaireiai, as members of the hetaireia and the hetairarch had places in imperial ceremonial (Oikonomidès 1972: 35, 63). That said, though, the roles of the members of a hetaireia were ad hoc, and the tastes of the leader/sponsor determined membership. Beck 1965: 26–27, also speaks of a possible hetaireia associated with Basil II that included members of the Komnenos family (Nikephoros Bryennios, Historia 1.2.1–2: Ἐπεὶ δὲ διηλλαξάτην ἄμφω (sc. Isaac and John Komnenos) τὴν ἥβην, εὐθὺς ταῖς βασιλικαῖς ἑταιρείαις συγκατελεγέτην), and still other ones in the tenth century (Beck 1965: 23–26).


157 For connections between monks and men in the world, see Turner 1990: esp. 34, 55, 106, 119, 231, 234–241. Morris 1995 is dedicated to interactions between monks and laymen and is relevant frequently on this point. More specifically, Morris 1995: 76–80, delineates ways in which monks frequently were indistinguishable from their secular brothers in terms of education and family background. She also discusses a number of interactions between the secular and sacred milieux (Morris 1995: 84–87). Morris 1995: 106, sums up a dynamic that she documents repeatedly throughout her study, referring here to relations of spiritual fatherhood: ‘From members of the Byzantine administrative “middle management” as far up as the imperial families themselves, the clients [of the monks acting as spiritual fathers] represented a cross-section of the Byzantine ruling class. They consulted their spiritual fathers either in person or by letter, and it is very likely that they were well aware of others who also sought guidance from the same source’. Of interest too is the title of Symeon’s fourth hymn, which is called ‘A teaching to the monks who have recently left the world and to those who are still in the world’ (Διδασκαλία εἰς μοναχοὺς ἄρτι ἀποταξαμένους κόσμῳ καὶ τοῖς ἐνκόσμῳ). He addresses monks and those who, not living in a monastery, desired guidance. Relevant too are the comments of Rapp 2016: 168–169, 192–193, 210, on relations between monks and laymen and the connections that Symeon maintained.
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158 Niketas Stethatos, *Vita Symeonis* 100.
159 Turner 1990: 11.

Chapter 4

* The paper would have been impossible without the help of many people. I wish to express my sincerest thanks to Dr. Michael E. Martin (University of Birmingham, UK) and Professor Patrick Nold (University at Albany, SUNY) for reading the draft and offering valuable suggestions on both the content and the style. I am also indebted to Prof. Timothy May (University of North Georgia), Prof. Roman Kovalev (The College of New Jersey), Kutluay Erk (Ege University, Turkey) and Sukhbaatarin Uganbayar (Monsudar Publishing LLC, Mongolia) for their valuable suggestions on the literature concerning falconry in Turkic and Mongol societies. Any errors that remain are of course my own.

4 Demetrios Soultanos Palaiologos’ father.
5 Philes, ed. Martini 1900, poem 56: 71–73.
6 Philes, ed. Martini 1900, poems 55 and 56: 69–70, ll. 1–32; 71–73, ll.1–32.
10 *PLP* 30346; Mikkelsch and Muller 1860–90, vol. 4: 285. The family name Χαδηνός could have been derived from χανάνω (Aorist ἔχάνον) (‘to take in, hold, comprise’). However, the *χαδηνός or any close form thereof is absent from any Ancient or Modern Greek dictionary, cf. Demetrakos 1953–58, vol. 15: 7757–7758, 7785; Andriotes 1967: 418 (lemma χάδι). Far more secure is the suggestion that his family name was made from the Arabic khadin (خدين ‘intimate friend, companion, confidant’), which was also attested as hadin in Ottoman Turkish: Devellioğlu 2000: 309.
15 Cf. ἡ βουζία, *Sambucus ebulus*, ‘elderberry’: Trapp 1994–2017: 289. There was also a location Bouzes (Βούζης) in Lemnos, mentioned in 1285: *Βυζαντινα ἐγγραφα τῆς*
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16 Rein 1915–16: 75–76; _PLP_ 3015, 3017.


18 _PLP_ 23606, 24896, 26952, 27123, 92402.


22 Gregoras, ed. Schopen and Bekker 1829–55, vol. 1: 44.7–12.


28 Philes, ed. Martini 1900: 72.15.

29 Such _laqabs_ were attested in the Seljuk inscriptions in Asia Minor: cf. the inscription in Tokat on the _türbe_ (mausoleum) and _medrese_ of Ḥājī Chīqarīq (Hacı Çıkarık), dated AH 578 (1182). The _türbe_ and _medrese_ were constructed on the orders of a certain _atābe\text{y}_ (atābeg) Badr al-Dīn Abū Manṣūr Shāhanshāh ibn Arslāntoghmush al-Sultānī; see Combe, Sauvaget and Wiet 1931–64, vol. 9, 3376–3377: 120–121; Ismail Hakkı (Uzunçarşılı) 1927: 62–63.

30 _PLP_ 26333–26341.
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45 Farzandān can be translated as ‘sons’ or ‘children’.

46 Nuzul, like its alternative reading nuzl, means ‘anything provided for a guest’ (in Arabic nuzl is the ‘food served for a guest’, and nazl (plur. nuzul) is ‘quarters, lodging; hotel, inn’). All other meanings (‘increase, enlargement of food when dressed’, ‘abundance of agricultural produce’, ‘a gift’, ‘a mansion or hospitable dwelling’) were derivations of the basic one. Steingass 2010: 1397.

47 Literally ‘what is necessary for them’, mā-yaḥtāj-i ışān.
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60 Gregoras meant the part of the Matins, called the Great Doxology, a special solemn prayer ‘Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill among men’.
62 When the dying sultan ʿIzz al-Dīn Kılıç Arslân II (1156–1192) appointed as his heir apparent Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw I (1192–1196, 1205–1211) out of his other sons, he proclaimed him ‘possessor of the crown and the seal-ring’. When the sultan ʿIzz al-Dīn Kay-Kāwūs I (1211–1219) died without issue, the courtiers brought to his brother ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād I (1219–1237) the turban and the seal-ring of the late sultan as a symbol (nishān) of power. Ibn-i Bibi, ed. Erzi (1956): 17, 204; Ibn Bibi, ed. Houtsma 1902: 4, 84; trans. Duda 1959: 18, 92.
63 Pachymeres, ed. Failler 1984–2000, vol. 1: 631.1–12, 657.9–22; PLP 21492; Failler 1982: 171–180. According to Failler, the younger sons of the emperor wore the clothes, but did not have the rank, of the Despot in the thirteenth century. Cf. Zakos’ observation: ‘Constantine is always mentioned in the sources as porphyrogennetos, and never as despotes; his rank in the court was higher than despotes and lower than basileus. The same rank was later bestowed on Matthew, son of John VI’: Zakos and Vegleri 1972–84, vol. 1.3, seal 2758: 1586. On John II Grand Komnenos and his visit to Constantinople, see Karpov 2007: 192–195.
65 In this case the expression ‘the insignia of power’, τοῖς τῆς ἀρχῆς συμβόλοις, in Pachymeres should be understood as an equivalent of the ‘insignia of the imperial power’, τὰ βασιλείας σύμβολα, in Pseudo-Kodinos (ed. Verpeaux 1976: 344.5–6), which suggests the insignia of the Despot, Sebastokrator and Caesar.
67 PLP 21426.
69 Laurent 1956: 357, 363.
70 Aksarayi, ed. Turan (1944): 70.
73 Namely ἀμήρας τῶν ἀμηράδων and μέγας σαρκᾶς.
74 Symeon Metaphrastes, Menology (February-April), MS Bodleian Library, Holkham Gr. 19, fol. 154r; ed. Demus and Hutter (1977–1997), vol. 3.1: 81–82.
75 Aksarayi, ed. Turan 1944: 74, 89, 97, 100.
79 I.e. among the retainers of Andronikos II. ‘Takwūr (tākwar)’, from the Armenian t’agawor, ‘king’, was one of the designations of the Byzantine emperors in the Ottoman sources.
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81 The identification of Mas‘ūd II and Melik Masour in Pachymeres is based on two suggestions. First, when in Byzantium in 1261–1264/5, he was called, according to Ibn Bibī, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Malik Mas‘ūd (İbn-i Bībī, ed. Erzi 1956: 639). Pachymeres might have remembered him as Malik Mas‘ūd afterwards. Secondly, if Pachymeres used a translation from an Arabic, or Persian, or Turkish source, a mistake in writing Mas‘ūd as Mas‘ūr was more than possible, as the letters د and ر often look very similar in the manuscripts: Korobeinikov 2001: 98.

82 This is based on the reading al-malik al-manṣūr, as some manuscripts of Pachymeres have Μανσούρ instead of Μασούρ. Al-malik al-manṣūr (‘The victorious king’) was a common title of the Seljuk princes and sultans. Beldiceanu-Steinherr 2000: 427; Korobeinikov 2004: 99–103.


89 For the τρισόλβιος and τρισμακάριστος during the Palaiologan period, see: Gregory Chioniades, Letters, ed. Papadorouλos 1927: 193 (the letter was addressed πρὸς τὸν τρισμακάριστον. . . Κύριον Ἀλέξιον βασιλέα τῶν Μέγαν Κοµνηνῶν, i.e. to Alexios II Grand Komnenos (1297–1330), the emperor of Trebizond); Philes, ed. Miller 1855–57, vol. 1, poem 44: 224.80, poem 63: 235.4, poem 75: 247.10. vol. 2, poem 11: 359.67; ed. Martini 1900, poem 96: 138.25. The only exclusions in Philes’ poetry were the mentions of the various ‘three times blessed’ cities and, just once, a ‘three times blessed youth’ Georgios Kapandrites: Philes, ed. Miller 1855–57, vol. 2, poem 62: 130.73, poem 237: 255.331; ed. Martini 1900, poem 89: 127.1 (cf. PLP 11008; Zachariadou 1964–65: 69).


96 According to Zachariadou 1964–65: 72, there were three Christian sons of Kay-Kāwūs II, besides the Muslim ones: Melik Constantine, Athanasios Soutlanos (*PLP* 26337) and the Soutlan of our verses of Philes (*PLP* 26333). Zachariadou did not read the Soutlan in Philes as a title ‘sultan’ (as I do), but as a name. She further suggested that our Demetrios Soutlanos Palaiologos had a brother Alexios Soutlanos Palaiologos (*PLP* 26338), despite the statement in Philes that Demetrios was ‘alan, the only one [child] from the second birth’ (οὗτος ἦν εἷς ἐκ γονῆς, φεῦ, δευτέρας); moreover, Demetrios Soutlanos Palaiologos was not a contemporary of Philes: when the epitaph was composed, ‘the froth laid near his dry bones’. Zhavoronkov 2006b: 168–171, 174, who accepted the conclusions of Zachariadou and employed more extensively the data in Ibn Bībī, suggested four sons in 1261: Mas’ūd II, Melik Masour, Melik Constantine and Rukn al-Dīn Kayūmarth, while Athanasios Soutlanos and the Soutlan in Philes were the sons of a certain Melik, the brother of Kay-Kāwūs II, who had moved to Nicæa before him in 1261 (Pachymeres, ed. Failler 1984–2000, vol. 1: 149.18–20; Gregoras, ed. Schopen and Bekker 1829–55, vol. 1: 82.4–8). His identifications contradict Philes. The study of Shukurov 2008: 107–111, though he did not consult Philes, demonstrated a more succinct and accurate approach. He correctly stated that Melik, the brother of Kay-Kāwūs II, did not exist. He was an invention of Gregoras, who misinterpreted the data in Pachymeres. His final list of the sultan’s sons is: Mas’ūd II (= Melik Masour), Melik Constantine, Rukn al-Dīn Kayūmarth and, presumably, a certain hieromonk Sabbas, ‘called Soltan’ in the *Synaxarion* of Sourzh, who died in 1320. His identification of the fourth son of Kay-Kāwūs II is based on the very shaky grounds of Sari Saltuk’s story in Yazıcıoğlu Ali.  


and its difference from the prokyps, see Poliakovskaja 2011: 59–70; prokyps, always outdoors, was a representation on a lit platform of the standing emperor surrounded with his family and the Despots, then of the sole emperor without his entourage, while anabathra, always indoors (which is why it was never mixed with the prokyps in Pseudo-Kodinos), suggested a dais in the form of a staircase, with the emperor’s throne on top, and sometimes surrounded with the thrones of the imperial family. Beihammer thought that the reception of 1162 was that of the prokyps, but the mention of the throne and the palace in Kinnamos (ed. Meineke 1836: 205.5–9, 206.11) strongly suggests the anabathra. Cf. Macrides, Munitiz and Angelov 2013: 401–411; the prokyps was an innovation on the part of Manuel I; not every ceremony on a platform was called prokyps; according to Pseudo-Kodinos, the prokyps was performed only two times per year, on Christmas Eve and the Epiphany.


102 One should note that the Despots in the Nicaean empire were exclusively the members of the Laskarid and Palaiologan dynasties: Zhavoronkov 1991: 84–86.


112 Hillenbrand 2007: 164.

113 Shukurov 2013: 134.

114 AstARABâDî 1928: 45; Shukurov 2013: 117.


116 Beihammer 2011: 648. His conclusion is based almost entirely on the Byzantine sources.

117 Peacock and Yıldız 2013: 3.


121 Hasluck 1929.

122 Korobeinikov 2013: 81.


125 Cf. Prinzing 2014: 29–33, though he advances other criteria.

Chapter 5

1 I am very grateful for the comments on this paper offered by Caillan Davenport, Shaun Tougher and John Haldon, and the anonymous reviewers. All remaining errors are my own. The research for this paper was conducted in part during my Summer Research Fellowship at Dumbarton Oaks in 2013, and in part during my Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung Postdoctoral Research Fellowship at the Goethe-Universität in Frankfurt am Main from 2013 to 2016, and I am deeply thankful for the opportunities these fellowships afforded.

2 Theodosius II was born on 10 April 401, and proclaimed Augustus on 10 January 402: see PLRE 2: 1100. He enjoyed an extraordinarily long reign, from his accession as a nine-month-old baby in 402, until his death following a horse-riding accident in 450.


4 Harries 2013: 71.

5 Valentinian I and his brother Valens ruled the empire from 364 to 375; when Valentinian I died he was succeeded by his sons Gratian and Valentinian II in the West. Theodosius II was acclaimed Augustus soon after the death of Valens and ruled alongside the two western Augusti.

6 On the domination of dynastic rule in the early principate see now Hekster 2015, and on the increasing emphasis on dynastic succession from the Constantinians in particular see most recently Börm 2015; see also McEvoy 2010: 157–158.

7 As Hekster 2015: 279–280, observes, the decision to ignore the claims of Constantine and Maxentius was ‘astounding’ – ‘never before had near-relatives, let alone sons, been ignored when looking for succession to the Roman throne’. See also on the preference for imperial sons as successors Corcoran 2012: 4–5.


11 Not. Dig. ch. 5–9; Jones 1964: I.174–175 and 178. See also Millar 2006: 45–46.

12 Jones 1964: I.178; see also now Lee 2013: 93.

13 Jones 1964: I. 178. Jones’ explanation has been followed by later historians, see e.g. recently Lee 2013: 102; Kelly 2013a: 11. Exactly how the East and West emerged at this point with different military command organisations is not clear.

14 See below for Anthemius, and on Helion, PLRE 2: 533.

15 Although of course his co-Augustus in the West, Valentinian III, survived him as emperor and in that sense the need for a further ‘heir’ is disputable – for discussion see Burgess 1993/1994: 49, 63–64.

16 E.g. the elevations of Marcian in 450 and Leo in 457; the murder of Aspar and his sons in 471; the deposition of Zeno by Basiliscus in 475 and vice versa; the revolt of Fl. Marcianus in 479.

17 Thoroughly explored recently by Lee 2013: esp. 94ff.

18 I have been unable to find any cases prior to those of the Ardaburii and Anthemii of families which could boast three direct generations of magistri militum.

19 On which see McEvoy 2013: 29–30. On the military role of the emperor see also Chapter 9 by Frank Trombley and Shaun Tougher in this volume.
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20 Fl. Ardaburius Aspar in particular has received attention (e.g. Scott 1976; Croke 2005, and now McEvoy 2016a), as has the western emperor Anthemius (e.g. O’Flynn 1991). For a general overview of the *magistri militum* of the later Roman empire and their family connections however, see Demandt 1970: 553–798.

21 As Priscus saw it: frag. 3.1 and 3.2 (Blockley 1983).

22 Theodosius’ only known living relatives beyond his sisters were his uncle the western emperor Honorius and his aunt, Galla Placidia, both resident in far-off Italy. Procopius, *Wars* 1.2.1–10, reports a story of Arcadius having approached the Persian king Yazdgard I (399–420) to act as guardian to his son, an interesting claim that does not however appear in any earlier source and modern scholars remained divided as to its veracity. For discussion see Holum 1982: 82–83. While legally we would expect the child Theodosius II to have been appointed a tutor until he came of age we have no record of the identity of this individual.

23 E.g. Sozomen 9.6.1; Theodoret 5.36.3. See also Millar 2006: 41; Szidat 2010: 391; Elton 2009: 142, and Lee 2013: 92. Holum argues for such an attempt by one Lucius, a pagan *magister militum* (on whom see Demandt 1970: 747), however the report appears only in the sixth century *Life of Isidore* by Damascius and is sensationalist in tone, describing the general entering the palace with sword drawn but withdrawing in terror upon finding the young emperor sheltered by a giant woman. The supposed attempt is undated and not reported in any other source. For discussion, see Holum 1982: 82.

24 For a full discussion of this phenomenon in the West in the same period, see McEvoy 2013.

25 For sources for Arcadius’ life and reign, see *PLRE* 1: 99.

26 For a detailed study of these developments see McEvoy 2013. The lack of comparable writings from the eastern court to those of the poet Claudian who wrote during Honorius’ youth in the West makes gaining a glimpse of the child-emperor Theodosius II and the presentation of his rule during his earliest years rather more difficult.


29 Sozomen 9.1.


33 Sozomen 9.1: ἣν μοι δοκεῖ μᾶλλα τὸν θεὸν ἐπιδεῖξαι μόνην εὐσέβειαν ἀρκεῖν πρὸς σωτηρίαν τοῖς βασιλεύοντι καὶ τὴν ἄλλην παρασκευὴν.

34 See similarly McEvoy 2013: 127–129, for Ambrose of Milan’s reports on the piety of Gratian and Valentinian II.


36 Although they did write about the years of Theodosius II’s minority too, the dating of their texts is firmly attributed to the early 440s and their histories continued up to this point – for discussion see Gardiner 2013: 245 and n. 6.

37 For discussion see Harries 1994: 38, and Gardiner 2013: 249–251, who explores particularly the panegyrical aspects of Socrates’ presentation of Theodosius II.

38 Sozomen 9.1.


Holum 1982: 143–144.


In contrast to the West – for recent analysis see Van Nuffelen 2013.

As both Harries and Kelly have pointed out: Harries 2013: 88; similarly Kelly 2013a: 54. As Corcoran 2012: 15, has written, in relation to an earlier period: ‘nervous emperors feared too many relatives, even as they wished for dynastic succession’.

Cf. Philostorgius 12.7. A view widely accepted by scholars, in particular Holum 1982: 96, who claims that after 414 Pulcheria went on to reassert the Theodosian house as a political force. As Kelly 2013a: 5, notes, traditional scholarship has portrayed Theodosius II as ‘a hen-pecked monarch pushed around by his elder sister’.


For sources on the life of Theodosius II’s wife, Athenais/Eudocia, see PLRE 2: 408–409, and also Holum 1982: 112–146; Busch 2015: 136–165.

Eudocia’s brothers, Valerius (PLRE 2: 1145) and Gessius (PLRE 2: 510–511), became consul in 432 and magister officiorum, and praetorian prefect of Illyricum, respectively.


See McEvoy 2016b.

Socrates 7.22.

Socrates 7.42: Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς τοῖς ἄλληθος ιερωμένοις ἐφαμίλλος ἦν καὶ συνάμοι τοὺς διότιν ἐθέλοντας ἀπεδέχετο.

55 As discussed by Kaegi 1968: 20, 23–24, regarding coins minted by Theodosius II at the time of Valentinian III’s accession after the campaign of 425.

Priscus frag. 3.1 and 3.2. See further Lee 2013: 96; also in general Kelly 2013a: 6. Even Theodosius’ father, the similarly unwarlike Arcadius, is attested as travelling outside Constantinople to meet an eastern army returning from the West in 395 (Zosimus 5.7.4–6), although this cannot have been a very pleasant experience since it led to his witnessing his praetorian prefect Rufinus’ murder by the troops. Theodosius II’s closest encounter with his military was presumably when he travelled to Thessalonica on the first part of the expedition to install Valentinian III as western emperor, but then abandoned his journey West due to ill health and returned to Constantinople, as Socrates 7.24.4 reports.
61 Socrates 7.1: Φρονιμώτατος δὲ τῶν τότε ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐδόκει καὶ ἦν, καὶ ἀβούλως ἐξαρταίοις οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ ἀνεκοινοῦτο πολλοῖς τῶν γνωρίμων περὶ τῶν πράκτων.
62 CTh 15.1.51. See further on the background to the construction of the Theodosian walls: Meyer-Plath and Schneider 1943; Cameron 1982: 240–241; Holm 1982: 89.
63 Another such dominant civilian adviser was Helion, the magister officiorum who similarly had a very long tenure of office, from 414 until at least 427: PLRE 2: 533.
64 Holm 1982: 94–95, suggests the candidate for Pulcheria’s hand was the grandson of Anthemius, Fl. Anthemius Isidorus Theophilus, but this cannot be proven.
65 As scholars such as Cameron 1982: 265–266, 271–272, Harries 2013: 72, and Van Nuffelen 2013: 136, have pointed out most recently. Holm 1982: 96, does concede that Anthemius may have simply died.
66 This Procopius (PLRE 2: 920) apparently claimed descent from the usurper of the same name in the 360s.
67 Demandt 1970: 777, notes Anthemius as magister militum praesentalis – PLRE however fails to include him on its list of magistri (PLRE 2: 1290) as Croke 2005: 150, points out.
68 Anthemius – PLRE 2: 96–98. On his marriage and military distinctions see Sidonius, Panegyric II, 193–204; Evagrius 2.16.
70 On the establishment of Anthemius as western emperor, see Evagrius 2.16; Hydatius (230 [234]), p. 119; Hydatius (241 [247]), p. 121; Priscus, frag. 50 and 53.3 (Blockley 1983); Marcellinus comes, s.a. 467 (1); Malalas 14.35; Procopius, Wars 3.6.5–6.
71 Marcellinus com. s.a. 472 (2); Malalas 14.45; Theophanes AM 5957. Ricimer’s loyalty to Anthemius had clearly not been won by his marriage in 467 to Anthemius’ young daughter Alypia (Sidonius, Ep. 1.5).
74 Longina – PLRE 2: 686.
77 Commemorated by the still extant Missorium of Aspar, on which see most recently Zaccagnino et al 2012. On the eastern government’s involvement in North African campaigns in the 430s, see Blockley 1992: 60.

81 Whom Sozomen 7.17.4 describes as the most powerful man in the palace in the 420s.


83 Ardabur iunior – *PLRE* 2: 135–137.

84 Leo I – *PLRE* 2: 663–664. E.g. for Aspar’s support of his accession, Candidus, frag. 1 (Blockley 1983); Theophanes AM 5961; Priscus, frag. 61 (Blockley 1983). See further Croke 2005: 151–152.


86 *Life of Daniel Stylite* 65; On the dating of Zeno and Ariadne’s marriage, see Croke 2003: 560–563.

87 Since Leontia was born to the purple, she can have been no more than thirteen years of age in 470: Croke 2005: 192–193. On Patricius declared Caesar: Evagrius 2.16; Priscus, frag. 53.5 and 61 (Blockley 1983); Candidus, frag. 1 (Blockley 1983); Marcellinus com. s.a. 471; Theophanes AM 5961 and AM 5963.

88 *Chron. Pasch.* 467. Numerous other sources record the murders, though none in great detail: Evagrius 2.16; Priscus, frag. 53.5 and 61 (Blockley 1983); Candidus, frag. 1 (Blockley 1983).

89 Aspar’s third son, Herminericus, was absent from Constantinople at the time of the murders, but survived and apparently prospered in the longer term: see *PLRE* 2: 549.

90 Dagalaiphus’ father, the *magister militum* Fl. Areobindus, had shared the consulship with Aspar in 434: *PLRE* 2: 145–146.

91 See *PLRE* 2: 410–412, and on her betrothal and marriage particularly, McEvoy 2013: 256–257.

92 A number of sources report on the return to Constantinople of Eudoxia and Placidia, during the reign of Leo I: Procopius, *Wars* 3.5.6–7; Malalas 14.31 (who however dates their return to the reign of Marcin); Theophanes AM 5947 and AM 5949. See further Croke 2005: 159; and now also Croke 2014.

93 Olybrius – *PLRE* 2: 796–798. See also on Olybrius’ career Clover, 1978, and generally on these connections Croke 2014: 100.


95 *Chron. Pasch.* 517. For a detailed account and analysis of the riots of 512, see Meier 2008.

96 Irene – *PLRE* 2: 626. See further on these connections between the families Croke 2014, and, going deeper into the sixth century, Cameron 1978.

97 *Chron. Pasch.* 450; Evagrius 1.22; Malalas 14.27; Theophanes AM5942.

98 In common with the western child-emperor courts of the period: for discussion, see McEvoy 2013: 321–324.

99 Millar 2006: 41–42. Kelly 2013a: 11, Harries 2013: 71–72, and Lee 2013: 103, all suggest that the lack of any great military victories on the part of the generals of Theodosius II, which would have led to their winning particular prestige and the personal loyalty of the army – at least until Zeno’s successes in the late 440s – may have been a factor in making military usurpation less likely. On the emergence of the Huns as a problem for the East in the 440s, see Heather 2005: 306–312, and Kelly 2008: 92–113.

100 Priscus frag. 15.4.25–6 (Blockley 1983); see for discussion Lee 2013: 92, 103.
Although Theodosius II died in an accident, his family was not long-lived: both his father and uncle had died of natural causes in their late 30s, and his grandfather Theodosius I had died before the age of 50.

Lee explores in detail the means by which Theodosius II might keep his generals loyal, such as through the awarding of the patriciate and the consulate, as well as financial rewards: Lee 2013: 104–105, 107. Lee further makes the thought-provoking argument that the fact that many of the high-ranking generals of Theodosius II’s era were of non-orthodox faith (‘Arians’ – or even pagans) may have been a factor in preventing their aiming for the throne: Lee 2013: 108.

For the Anthemii: Procopius, Anthemius and Marcianus; for the Ardaburii: Ardabur, Aspar and Ardabur Junior. Aspar’s colleague as consul in 434, the magister militum Ariobindus, would have a grandson (the husband of Anicia Juliana) who was also magister militum, and Plinta, the Gothic general with whom the Ardaburii were also allied, had a son Armatius (PLRE 2: 148) who was a dux or comes. See also Lee 2013: 101, who does not however include the Anthemii as a military dynasty.

The family alliances of the Ardaburii have been traced in particular by Demandt 1970: 771.

For the Anthemii: Anthemius and Euphemia in 453, Marcianus and Leontia in c. 471. For the Ardaburii: Patricius and Leontia in c. 470, Areobindus and Anicia Juliana after 479.
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2 Liudprand, Legatio 19.
7 Strano 2013: 449–450.
8 Marquis de la Force 1936: 154.
13 Marquis de la Force 1936: 164.


22 Pryor and Jeffreys 2012: 39–40, 64, 76–78.

23 Alexios’ exploitation of logistics is illustrated by, for example, his blockade of Bohemond’s forces at Dyrrachium in 1108, as expounded by Anna Komnene, *Alexiad* 13.8.5–6, ed. Reinsch and Kambylis 2001: 406–407.


29 Zuckerman 2005: 83–84; see also Jankowiak 2013: 299 n.276.


32 *PmbZ* #3927; *PmbZ* #4975.

33 *PmbZ* #1212.

34 *PmbZ* #6253; Shepheard 2017.

35 The association made in early sources between the young Basil and the world of Bulgars and Slavophones was pointed out by Kislinger 1981: 147–150. The implications of this await further exploration. See *PmbZ* #832.


37 Michael Psellos, *Chronographia* 3.2.

38 As suggested by Oikonomidès 1999: 10.


41 On Leo’s role, see Büttner 2007: 31, 34, 50–51.


in eleventh-century Byzantium, which could have sparked interest in Latin texts amongst others besides Romanos Argyros, see Krallis 2009: 50–51, and also now Penna 2014: 401–403, 426–427.

45 In so far as Attaleiates attends to divine agency, he appears to observe conventions, while viewing piety and high-mindedness essentially in terms of benefit to the Roman state, without strongly Christian connotations: Krallis 2012: 181–184, 187–189, 194–195, 200–205. On our lack of an ecclesiastical narrative from the Byzantine vantage-point, see Cheynet 2007.

46 Ed. Hagenmeyer 1901: 141, 153. See also Hagenmeyer 1901: 241 n.15, 297 n.20 (showing undue scepticism as to the deliberateness of Alexios’ wording).


48 On Urban’s predilection for invoking *fides catholica, ecclesia catholica* and other variations, see Becker 2012: 70–71, 75–80.


50 This emerges from Paschal’s answer: ed. Jaffé *et al.* 1888: no. 6334; Bayer 2002: 196–197 and n.123.


57 Magdalino 2003: 50–51.

58 Ryder 2018.


63 Shepard 2005: 298 (text), 304 (translation).


66 Alexios is credited with offering an ‘argument’ (*lemma*) on behalf of the eastern position on the *filioque*, while debating with ‘the bishop of Milan’, presumably Pietro Grossolano: *PG* 102, col. 400A, and n.98.

67 The dating and, indeed, processes of compilation and completion of the *Armoury* remain uncertain: Beck 1959: 614, 616; Malamut 2007: 240; Rigo 2009: 31–32. Title 27 of the *Armoury* is called ‘Against Bogomils’. Its detailed presentation of their teachings is introduced and rounded off by accounts of how the Bogomil leader Basil was tracked down, out-argued, exposed and condemned by ‘our most wise and magnanimous emperor’: *PG* 130, cols. 1289–1332, at cols. 1289D–1292A, 1332B–C. See Shepard 2010: 771–773.

68 *PG* 130, col. 875C; *PG* 102, cols. 391–400. Azymes rank among contemporary devi-

69 *PG* 130, cols. 1332–1360; Shepard 2010: 773.


74 Haskins 1910: 295 (text), 294 (commentary).


78 Ed. Mabille 1874: 80, no. 92; for his links with Alexios and with Stephen of Blois, see Shepard 2005: 298 (text), 303 (translation), 314–317 (commentary).


81 Shepard 2005: 300, 299 (text), 305 (translation).

82 Shepard 2005: 300, 299 (text), 305 (translation).

83 Riley-Smith 1997: 127.

84 Koder 2002: 134.

85 On Manuel’s attempts at rapprochement, if not reunion, with the West, see Magdalino 1988; Magdalino 1993. For treatment of significant antecedents in the reign of Alexios to the phenomenon of Manuel Komnenos, see Rodriguez Suarez 2014.

**Chapter 7**

1 I am indebted to Niccolò Fattori, Andrea Nanetti and Eugenia Russell for their linguistic advice and to Shaun Tougher and an anonymous referee for their encouragement and their comments on the first draft of this chapter.


5 Gill 1959: 54–56; *PLP* 17981.


7 Harris 2009: 173; Ganchou 2010; Harris 2012: 126.
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14 Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 608, f. 270.


16 PLP 7651 records a Michael Theophilos on Cyprus in 1397. An individual of the same name was in Spain as a refugee in 1479: De la Torre (1949–1965), vol. 1: 25 (no. 34).


24 Page 2008: 279–280; McKee 2000: 2, 75; Wright 2011: 73.


29 Badoer 1956: 488: A di 8 Mazio 1439 per zenere de so raxon e mia e de Zuan Jarachi, per la mità che i tocha de perp. 400 che per avanti di a Atumi Protochumino per la parte che speta a nui a pagar de i noli de le dite zenere – c.314 perp.

30 Badoer 1956: 630: Zenere sachi 304, che doveva eser 310 ma per el patròn ne fo butà 6 in mar, de raxon de Zanin Jarachi e Antumi Protochumino, e de Francesco de i Albizi e mia, zascun de nui per un quarto, rezevude per la griparia patròn Zorzi da Scarpano, le qual sono in man de Antonio Protochumini da Rodi, le qual zenere pexò in Tripoli chant. 303 r. 28 Damascini, diè dar a di 14 Fever, per cassa chontadi al dito Zorzi da Scarpano patròn de la griparia, per parte de la nostra mitade de i noli ch’el diè aver, zioè per Francesco di i Albizi e mi – c.289 perp.


32 Harris 2013: 645–649.


34 Cappelli 1891: 168.

35 Cerone 1902: 823.

36 Archives Départementales du Nord, Lille. B2034 (Chambre des Comptes de Lille, Jan.–Sept. 1459), f. 172 ; Le Glay et al. 1863–1906, vol. 4: 207: Au chancelier de l’empereur de Constantinople, derrain trépassé, la somme de trois cens livres, pour don à lui fait par Monseigneur pour lui aidier à deffrayer de la dicte ville de Mons, où il est nagaires venu par devers mondit Seigneur en ambassade, de par nostre Saint Père, pour le fait de la foy chrestienne.

37 Lemerle 1948: 315; Lemerle 1964: 43.
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1 For a reconstruction of this work in 16 books from fragments used in Justinian I’s Digest, see Lenel 1889: 652–675.
2 Lloyd-Jones 1972.
3 Lloyd-Jones 1972: 55.
4 Lloyd-Jones 1972: 56.
5 Most recently, Stolte 2015: 356.
6 Scholion 1 ad B. 2,1,14 (Scheltema ed. 1953: 4.19). After the promulgation of the Basilika explanations stemming from sixth-century commentaries on the Digest were added as scholia to the text.
8 More than any other prooimion it sets out a particular theological-philosophical theory of the law, which reflected Photios’ views (for literature, see previous footnote).
9 Schminck 1994.
11 Aerts et al. 2001: 145 (Appendix IV: ‘Law and legislation in Byzantine political thought’).
12 Signes Codoñer 2007.
14 Stolte 2009: 77.
16 Millar 1986. See also Millar 2006.
20 Cf. Simon 1973: 9–10, about the Court of the Hippodrome as a Klassengericht.

Chapter 9

1 Sadly, Frank Trombley died in December 2015, before the completion of this volume.
2 An exception is the analysis provided by Treitinger 1956.
3 It is a shame that Taxiarchis Kolias did not have time to publish his ‘The Byzantine emperor as warrior’ in J. Koder and I. Stouraitis, eds., Byzantine War Ideology between
**INTRODUCTION**


5 For Late Byzantine attitudes to the military role of emperors see the comments by Savvas Kyriakidis (Chapter 14, this volume).
6 On the Roman emperor and the army see Campbell 1984.
8 On Julian see for instance Tougher 2007.
13 For text, translation and commentary see Dennis 2014, and for extended commentary Haldon 2014.
14 For instance McGee 2008.
15 See Markopoulos 2012. See also the comments by Prerona Prasad in her chapter in this volume.
24 *Vita Basilii* 46, ed. trans. Ševčenko 2011: 165. ‘taking along his eldest son Constantine, he set out with him against Syria, so as to give that cub of noble race a taste for slaying the enemy and to be himself his teacher in tactics and manly valor in the face of peril’; Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *What should be observed when the great and high emperor of the Romans goes on campaign*, ed. and trans. Haldon 1990, Text C: 140–147 (*De cer.* 1, Appendix, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 498–503). According to Leo the Deacon, *Historia* 3.6, ed. Hase 1828: 45.4–5, trans. Talbot and Sullivan 2005: 95, when Nikephoros Phokas offered to become emperor in 963 one of the things he committed to do was ‘oversee [the] physical training’ (σωματική πράξη) of Basil II and Constantine VIII. Leo also describes how once he had become emperor Nikephoros gave military training to the servants and household retainers who attended on him: *Historia* 3.9, ed. Hase 1828: 50.21–51.5, trans. Talbot and Sullivan 2005: 100–101.
35 The term ‘military units’ (tû tágmatâ tû stratiotikû) surely refers to the theme armies, and not guards’ formations stationed in Constantinople: Stouraitis 2009: 108–109. The training, some of it personally supervised by Basil I, is therefore likely to have taken place in the nearer themes of Asia Minor.
37 Dirty standards would have posed serious problems in engagements, their colour and symbols on them being difficult to recognise. Cf. Grosse 1924. The passage is remarked on by Dennis 1981: 57.
38 Attaleiates, *Historia* 17.2, ed. and trans. Kaldellis and Krallis 2012: 188–191. Romanos IV is likely to have mustered the themes in the vicinity of Amorion-Polybotes, as this area had the sprawling grasslands necessary for foddering many thousands of horses, mules and oxen: personal observation of F.R. Trombley, 3 September 2014.
45 On the relationship between Attaleiates and Psellos and their histories see Krallis 2012: 71–114. Krallis asserts that ‘the History is a point-by-point refutation of the Chronographia’s defamatory account of Romanos IV Diogenes’ career’ (p. 81), and cites an example of Attaleiates contradicting military advice offered by Psellos (p. 89). Krallis also analyses Attaleiates’ treatment of the military efforts of Romanos IV (pp. 126–134).
48 See Luvaas 1966: 142.
49 One sees this in contemporary warfare as well: see for example Melvin 2010: 265.
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52 Leo VI, Taktika 20.2, ed. trans. Dennis 2014: 536–539. This advice echoes that found in Maurice’s Strategikon 8.1.1 and earlier manuals: see the commentary by Haldon 2014: 421.
55 De cer. 1.63, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 281. The acclamations are for the anniversary of the accession of emperors. Dagron 2010: 241, argues that the acclamations date to the reign of Constantine VII.
61 Leo the Deacon, Historia 9.12, ed. Hase 1828: 158.10–23, trans. Talbot and Sullivan 2005: 201. Leo the Deacon also records that the emperor ‘changed the name of Dorystolon to Theodoropolis in honor of the warrior and martyr Theodore the Stratelates’, who was rumoured to have intervened in the battle against the Rus, and ‘whom the emperor used to beseech for help in battle, and to protect and preserve him together with all the army’: Historia 9.12 and 9.9, ed. Hase 1828: 158.1–2 and 154.7–9, trans. Talbot and Sullivan 2005: 200 and 197.
64 On Kekaumenos and his text see the Sharing Ancient Wisdoms website for text, translation and commentary by Charlotte Roueché: http://www.ancientwisdoms.ac.uk/library/kekaumenos-consilia-et-narrationes/ (accessed 5.9.18). See now also Ransohoff 2018.

Chapter 10

1 I am grateful to Shaun Tougher for inviting me to participate in the Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies at Cardiff in April 2014. Much of the argument is based on primary evidence, but some deliberately selective and brief annotation has been added, along with alteration to suit written rather than oral treatment.
2 As is evident at multiple points in Whitby 1998.
3 Though the situation must surely have been different in smaller towns, see Maxwell 2006: ch. 2, for discussion of opportunities to listen to rhetoric at Antioch.

45
4 See Kelly 1995: 56, on John Chrysostom’s first sermon at Antioch: ‘We may be sure that Flavian did not feel in the least embarrassed by the exaggerated compliments, and that the huge audience savoured with relish the carefully arranged periods and contrived repetitions, the recherché vocabulary and the skilful use of commonplaces (topoi) dear to practised orators.’

5 See the brief remarks of Drake 2012: 35.

6 Numerous troupes of entertainers criss-crossed the provinces of the empire; presumably, they appeared in small towns in something of a regular cycle, rather like the fairs and circuses of more modern times. Evidence is limited, but fragments of more than one green glass cup bearing the images and names of the same gladiators, in Colchester and Leicester, suggest that some troupes carried a stock of souvenirs to sell; see Allason-Jones 2011: 221–226, who is more cautious on the possibility that these were sold at performances. At times, travelling entertainment could serve a political purpose. An example is the spectacles provided by Titus as he worked his way around the East with his multitude of captives before returning to Rome from Judaea (Jos., Bell. Iud. 7.96). Similarly, heads of usurpers might be affixed to pikes as they were transported along the roads of the empire; here, the political message superceded any entertainment value – proof of death to residual supporters, like the inhabitants of Philippolis, who continued to support Procopius until they saw his head pass by on its way to Gaul and the court of the senior emperor Valentinian I (Amm. Marc. 26.10.6; 27.2.10); see Lenski 2002: 81–82. As for visual entertainment, Ando 2000: 257, mentions the possibility that painted images of battles accompanied victory bulletins that emperors regularly sent to the provinces as well as to Rome and Constantinople. On paintings paraded in Roman triumphs, see Ando 2000: 253–259, and Lusnia 2006: esp. 284ff.


8 John Chrysostom regularly upbraided his audiences for enjoying rhetoric more than religion; in the words of Kelly 1995: 57, ‘he often inveighed bitterly against the crowds which flocked to church exclusively to listen to the preacher, only to rush off before the awesome climax when Christ would reveal himself in the holy mysteries’.

9 Perhaps even then, ‘the medium [was] the message’, as Marshall McLuhan (1964: 7) proclaimed.

10 For crowds at Antioch, see Kelly 1995: 57 (quoted in n. 4 above); even pagans attended his sermons: Kelly 1995: 82. At Constantinople, Chrysostom very quickly built up a following that supported him and even blocked attempts to arrest him when he was sentenced to banishment; see, in general, Kelly 1995: 115–116, 229 and passim.


13 Thus, for example, Gorgias, Encomium of Helen. Later orators continued to deliver such speeches. Examples include Dio Chrysostom’s In Praise of Hair, In Praise of the Gnat and In Praise of a Parrot; the last two are not extant, but the first is quoted in Synesius’ In Praise of Baldness. For some remarks about such works from Gorgias to Libanius, see Russell 1998: 22–23.

14 Xenophon’s Agesilaos and Isocrates’ Evagoras are generally regarded as the earliest extant treatments to apply the techniques of epideictic rhetoric to contemporaries rather than mythical figures. For brief discussion, see Russell and Wilson 1981: xiii–xv.

15 Known as either ‘The King’s Peace’ or ‘The Peace of Antalcidas’.

16 It may be that the two treatises of outlines for various speeches were compiled by different writers, most likely in the third century. For discussion of these points, as well as the texts and translations, see Russell and Wilson 1981.
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17 Perhaps the best extant examples on a model ruler are the speeches of Dio Chrysostom to Trajan. See Jones 1978: 115–123.

18 The late Roman period provides better, sometimes the only specific, evidence and examples; the remarks in the text nevertheless apply to all periods. The Egyptian poet Claudius Claudianus travelled to Rome and found a patron in Stilicho, the father-in-law of Honorius (395–423) and the power behind the throne. Among his poems are a number of panegyrics in epic verse of both his patron Stilicho and the emperor Honorius, most, if not all, recited publicly. On Claudian, see Cameron 1970.

19 Assurance of loyalty may be an objective of Latinus Pacatus Drepanius’ panegyric of Theodosius I in 389; he represented one or more Gallic communities that had fallen under the control of the usurper Magnus Maximus (r. 384–388), and he needed both to excuse that circumstance and to offer loyalty to Theodosius. See Nixon and Rodgers 1994: 437–447, for discussion.

20 The best examples come from the Roman imperial world, where Pliny the Younger and Claudius Mamertinus thanked Trajan in 100 and Julian in 362 respectively for the consulsships given to them.

21 See Vanderspoel 2006: 127, for brief remarks, in the context of the proliferation of schools of rhetoric in the Hellenistic world, about the utility of rhetoric in the context of the relationship between ruler and ruled. On the development of rhetoric in the Hellenistic world more generally, see Pernot 2005: 57–82. More broadly, see Kennedy 1994, which encapsulates his several previous works, and Porter 2001, a wide-ranging collection of essays on numerous topics. On utility of training in rhetoric of various types in the later Roman period, see Heath 2004, especially his final chapter on ‘The relevance of rhetoric’ (277–331).

22 Of the panegyrics in the Latin collection, the names of only five, including Pliny and Claudius Mamertinus (see n. 20 above), are known. The other seven remain anonymous, though most were presumably orators and/or prominent citizens. For what is known, see the introductions to the individual speeches in Nixon and Rodgers 1994. Rees 2002 treats four of these panegyrics in great detail and outlines what is known about their authors.

23 See, for example, Suetonius, Augustus, 51, 55–56.

24 Humphries 1998 calls Hilary of Poitiers’ Against Constantius an anti-panegyric. On this and similar contemporary works, see now Flower 2013, who calls them invective; his discussion regularly addresses the use of the techniques of panegyric. For a full study of a specific invective, see Long 1996.

25 Inevitably, rivals and political enemies might accuse an orator of employing flattery for personal gain – whether or not a speech was pure flattery and/or whether or not any gain accrued. See Vanderspoel 1995: 108–110, 208–210, and passim, for Themistius’ experiences in this regard.


27 See also the chapter in this volume by Nikolaos Chrissis, examining the orations of Niketas Choniates for Theodore I Laskaris and suggesting that he was ‘offering advice and suggesting a political programme’.


29 Libanius, Or. 14.25, speaks of requesting assistance for Aristophanes in the knowledge that Julian was interested in every family and individual. Menander, Treatise II.375 (Russell and Wilson 1981: 89), suggests that under the head of justice an orator should mention mildness toward subjects, humanity in regard to petitioners and an emperor’s accessibility.

30 Very briefly, Vanderspoel 2006: 125–127, citing earlier work on several aspects of the topic in the notes to those pages.

31 Treatise II.368 (= Russell and Wilson 1981: 76).

MacCormack 1981 remains the classic treatment, though much work has been done on numerous details subsequently.

The Nika Riot at Constantinople in AD 532 is the best-known example, and, naturally, every book on Justinian I and on Theodora discusses it. See also Greatrex 1997, who notes that the event was hardly unique and places it in the context of similar occurrences.

See Vanderspoel 1995 for a more detailed treatment of his life and work.

Essentially, that is the central interpretation of Vanderspoel 1995; see 4–5 and 217–221, for the most succinct statements of the point.

For testimony on this point from someone other than Themistius, see Julian, *Ep. ad Them.* 254b: ‘I thought that it was unlawful for you to flatter or deceive’, responding to Themistius’ favourable remarks and encouragement of the young Caesar. On *parrhēsia*, the licence to speak the truth that philosophers possessed, see Brown 1992: 61–70.

For example, at *Or.* 3.44b–46c and *Or.* 7.84b–86b.

These themes appear regularly in Vanderspoel 1995: *passim*. A thorough consideration of these topics that reaches different conclusions may be found in Heather and Moncur 2001: 12–42. In brief, Heather and Moncur tend to regard flattery as a technique employed by Themistius to promote an emperor’s existing or planned programme and in the interest of personal advancement, not as a device to attract imperial attention to proposals and suggestions for an emperor’s consideration.

See Vanderspoel 1995: 1–5, for a brief survey.

See Vanderspoel 2012a for a recent reconsideration of Themistius’ views about the relative statuses of Rome and Constantinople.

It is perhaps worth noting here that Themistius appears on occasion to promote different views on issues at different times. That does not transform him into a venal flatterer, unless every political figure who has ever changed his or her mind in the course of a 40-year career is also regarded as venal. Individuals, even politicians, do change their minds sometimes, often for very good reasons. We cannot always know why Themistius chose a different view than that he had expressed earlier, and, at any rate, there are also issues where Themistius’ views are consistent; the status of Constantinople is one of those issues.

See Heather 1991: 115–192, for a far more detailed treatment of the period summarized here.

Dagron 1968: 95–112, treats this in some depth, pointing out that Themistius and others were opposed to the military policy of Valens; see, briefly, Vanderspoel 1995: 175–176.

In that context, the city’s population had enraged Valens, when he passed through on his journey to his demise at Hadrianople, by implying that the emperor had not provided adequately for the city’s security against the Goths: they offered to take care of the task themselves, if only the emperor would provide them with weapons. According to Socrates, *HE* 4.38.5, Valens responded by threatening to overturn the city and plough the site upon his return from battle. Some assurance of their safety may well have been needed before its inhabitants could feel secure about any arrangement with Goths.

That is a typical interpretation of the speech; see, among others, Heather 1991: 158–175. For a different view, Vanderspoel 1995: 205–208, with reference to other treatments.


*Or.* 16.199e–d. If Themistius had indeed retired from public life or from public speaking, Theodosius presumably called upon a well-known proponent of peace to persuade
the city’s inhabitants of the benefits of the peace he had just concluded. Themistius was known to Theodosius for a pair of earlier speeches, and he did subsequently deliver a few more speeches and serve as prefect of Constantinople in the mid 380s before disappearing from view in the latter years of the decade.

49 Themistius does claim to have changed Valens’ mind once or twice: Or. 31.354d. In Or. 34.13, he also takes credit for bringing back several honours for Constantinople secured during his sojourn at Rome during Constantius’ visit there in 357. See Vanderspoel 1995: 104–106.

50 Angelov 2003: 65–70.

51 Rees 2002.

52 The legitimacy of Constantine was an open question, as Diocletian sought unsuccessfully to accommodate his self-aggrandizement with offers of a status lower than his claim that he had succeeded his father as Augustus at York in 306.

53 For a thorough survey, see Drinkwater 1987.

54 There is no consensus on where the Gallic emperors maintained their primary residence, but Trier and Cologne are the likely candidates. Maximian certainly resided at Trier while in northern Gaul; the city was thus an established imperial residence when Constantine arrived, even if Postumus (259–268) and his successors had not made it their imperial home.


56 See Amm. Marc. 30.10. When Valentinian died suddenly at Bregetio, officials soon named his four-year-old son Valentinian Augustus without prior approval of Valens or Gratian. One consideration was that military units in Gaul did not always support legitimate emperors and regarded themselves as the arbiters of legitimate rule (ut imperiorum arbitri) – who might desert Gratian, then at Trier. A new familial Augustus could generate a little caution in Gaul. Also, Merobaudes and Sebastianus, previously sent into Alamannic territory, were repositioned. Merobaudes acted as if he was required to return with the messenger, suspecting that his Gallic troops might misbehave, while Sebastianus was posted somewhat farther away, since he was held in high regard by the troops and was thus a threat. The Historia Augusta, Firmus, Saturninus, Proculus et Bonosus, 7.1, states that Saturninus was a Gaul, ‘from a very restless nation of men always zealous either to make an emperor or an empire’. The fact that Zosimus 1.61.1 calls him a Moor, probably correctly, is irrelevant to the sentiment here outlined.

57 I use here the numeration that reflects the sequence of orations in the manuscripts without the traditional use of a secondary numerations, which differ at some points.

58 This legitimacy, dubious or otherwise, may not apply to Maximian’s son Maxentius, whose role in the return of his father is buried in studied vagueness. It may therefore be the case that the orator preferred Constantine, but includes Maximian to boost Constantine’s legitimacy, through his daughter and through the claim that he, a former Augustus, gave the title to Constantine, who had been content with the title Caesar (a false claim, though he did allow the East to think that it was true). That is why Maximian needed to be re-legitimized in the speech, by questioning his forced retirement and by the plaintive cries of Roma herself for his return.


61 Casey 1994: 53. The orator refers to a ‘levy’ (Pan. Lat. VIII[5] 12.1: dilectum) of Gallic merchants, who along with others, became part of Carausius’ naval forces. As Nixon and Rodgers 1994: 129, n. 43, point out, there is no reason to assume that the merchants were forced to join the usurpation, especially in the recent context of the Gallic Empire.

62 See Drake 2012: 38, for convenient reference.
63 See Tougher 2012 for the view that this oration, too, is worthy of more detailed examination than it was previously accorded.
64 On the military role of emperors see Chapter 9 by Trombley and Tougher in this volume.
65 Vanderspoel 2012b: 325–326. The coinciding argument is that scholars have been partially wrong to follow Julian’s own complaint that the stay at Macellum was an exile. He was indeed removed from his home at Constantinople, but he was secure (and perhaps conveniently out of the public eye) and could be brought up with some attention to his role as a prince of the dynasty at Macellum.

Chapter 11

1 This might be due to the empresses’ crucial role in the restoration of the icons and their subsequent religious cult (quite popular and enthusiastic), along with the great appeal that these fascinating (female) figures have traditionally held for scholars (mainly men). All of them stand out for their saintliness, piety and, of course, their orthodoxy (i.e., they were strong iconodules). In general, see Deliernaux 2014: 376–378. As regards Irene, see Halkin 1988a; Treadgold 1982; Garland 1999: 73–94; Herrin 2001: 51–129. For Theodora, see Markopoulos 1983; Vinson 1998; Garland 1999: 95–108; Herrin 2001: 185–239, and for Theophano, see Kurtz 1898; Diehl 1908: 187–192; Majeska 1977; Cesaretti 1988; Alexakis 1995; Garland 1999: 126–135.
3 Diehl 1931; Rosser 1983. As an historical figure, see PmbZ 8167; PBE 1: Theophilos 5; Treadgold 1988: 263–329, esp. 327–329; Signes Codovan 2014.
4 Theoph. Cont. 100, 9–12. The dating of Theophilos’ decree is uncertain. It is usually ascribed to the year 833 since the Abbasid court was considered to have imitated the measure when Al-Ma’mūn proclaimed an edict on the creation of the Koran and the birth of the Miḥna (the Inquisition), dated perfectly in 833, see Jokisch 2007: 500–501; Rosser 1983: 41–42. Warren Treadgold believes that this measure triggered a synod: Treadgold 1988: 280–281, 436 n. 386. For Theophilos’ iconoclast policy, see Treadgold 1988: 277–281.
5 For the Vita of Peter of Atroa, see Laurent 1956: chap. 63–64. For the Vita of Niketas the Patrician, see Papachryssanthou 1968: 329, chap. 4. For the Vita of the Patriarch Ignatios, see Smithies and Duffy 2013: chap. 8 (PG 105: 493C) and chap. 14 (PG 105: 500A). For the Vita of the Patriarch Methodios, see PG 100: 1249D, 1253A. For that of Hilaron of Dalmatos, see Matantseva 1993: 22, col. 40.
6 Such was the case of John of Kathara (SynaxCP 633–634.35–38), Hilaron of Dalmatos (SynaxCP 733–734.45–50), Makarios of Pelekete (van den Gheyn 1897: 159.26), Symeon of Lesbos (van den Gheyn 1899: 238), the Graptoi brothers Theodore and Theophanes (Cunningham 1990: 70.23) and many others (van den Gheyn 1899: 239.17–18).
7 SynaxCP 231.9–234.7.
8 Van den Gheyn 1899: 239; PG 105: 900C–901B; Featherstone 1980; Cunningham 1990: 84.12–84.30. See also Vita Antonii iunioris (see Papadopulos-Kerameus 1907: chap. 31–32); Vita Michaelis Syncelli (see Cunningham 1990: 72.19–26; 74.27–31; 76.8–11; 78.23–80.1).
9 This was the ‘true’ battle of all those said to take place here, since Byzantine historians mention it on different occasions, giving rise to a certain amount of confusion. In reality, a few days before the fall of Amorion to the troops of al-Mu’tasim, Theophilos confronted Amer, the Emir of Melitene, actually called ‘Amr Ibn ‘Abd Allah al-Aqta, ‘The one-armed’, in this enclave; see PmbZ 8552; Bury 1909.
According to the historians belonging to the group of the Logothete, see Pseudo-Symeon 636–637; Symeon Logothetes 130.28. See Varona Codeso 2010: 60.

Treadgold 1979: 182 onwards. For Manuel the Armenian, see PmbZ 4707; PBE 1: Manuel 6; Grégoire 1933a; Grégoire 1934; Brubaker and Haldon 2011: 424; Signes Codoñer 2014: 83–102. See also Hirsch 1876; Bury 1912: 143 onwards; Vasiliev and Canard 1935, vol. 1: 154 onwards. The many marvellous feats that the Byzantine chroniclers attribute to Manuel after this date have led some researchers to consider that Manuel survived the restoration.


SynaxCP 851.57. See Halkin 1954: 9–11. The bibliography concerning the hagiographic news of Manuel the magistros is abundant: see Grégoire 1933b; Mango 1977: 133–134; Duffy and Parker 1979: appendix II, 156; Signes Codoñer 2006; Varona Codeso 2010: 269–284; Signes Codoñer 2013.

PmbZ 8050; PBE 1: Theoktistos 3; Malyshevskij 1887.

Symeon Logothetes 131.2 [232.5–6 Wahlgren]; Pseudo-Symeon, 647.7–9: ὑποθήκη δὲ καὶ παρανεῖσε Θεοκτίστου κανικλείου καὶ λογοθέτου. On the importance of the role played by Theoktistos, see Dvornik 1933: 34–45, 88–92.

Symesios 57.78–80.

Halkin 1954: 11–14. According to this author, his entry in a liturgical book was not possible prior to the second patriarchate of Ignatios (867–877) after the deaths of both his murderer, Caesar Bardas, and the emperor Michael, who had acquiesced to his murder.

SynaxCP 244.16–18; Halkin 1955: 57–58.


SynaxCP 777.5–778.16. In regard to Sergios Niketiates see PmbZ 6664; PBE 1: Sergios 57; Grégoire 1933a: 515–531; Guillard 1971: 51, no. 11; Varona Codeso and Prieto Dominguez 2013.

A brief mention of him also appears in the Acta Davidis: see van den Gheyn 1899: 245.31. His body was transferred to the monastery of the Theotokos of Niketiates that he had founded on the Gulf of Nicomedia, see Janin 1969: 320–321; Ruggieri 1991: 227.

PmbZ 5929; PBE 1: Petronas 5; Halkin 1944; Guillard 1970: 597–598; Treadgold 1979: 175 onwards.

Van den Gheyn 1899: chap. 31, 252.15–22; Abrahamse and Domingo-Forasté 1998: 229–230; Karlin-Hayter 2004: 348. This prophecy was most likely taken from the history of Antony the Younger, either from his vita, or from historians such as the Continuator: see below. For Kazhdan 1984 this prediction allows the Acta to be dated to 863. See also van den Gheyn 1899: 245–246.

PmbZ 11651; See Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1907: chap. 1, 187.5–24; chap. 44, 216.17–25; Halkin 1944: chap. 19. The traditional dating of this hagiography was deduced by Halkin 1944, 192–193 and 208, who affirmed that it would have been written between 877 and 886 or else during the period of reconciliation between the followers of Photios and Ignatios that Antony Kauleas made possible in 899. For her part, Martha Vinson considered the death of the empress Theophano (897) as the terminus post quem for this vita, since in her view it justifies the fourth marriage of Leo VI by presenting the father of Antony the Younger as remarrying, despite already having a male heir (Vinson 1998: 483–485). Her idea is seductive, but the attitude of Antony the Younger and his brothers abandoning their father shows that they did not approve of his new marriage, and therefore this text could hardly have been written at the court of Leo VI, during his second marriage. Moreover, the hagiographer affirms that he had visited St. Antony shortly
before his death. This fact, added to the slightly later death of abbot Clement (in 868) and the absolute lack of posthumous miracles or events leads us to consider an earlier composition, not much later than 865.

26 Halkin 1944: chaps. 10–12.
27 Halkin 1944: chap. 15. The story is told in a slightly different way in the historians: John was a famous monk on Mount Latros, near Ephesus, well known for never leaving his cell. However, when he found out that Petronas was in the area, John set off to announce to him that he could count on God’s protection and that he should place the image of St. John the Divine on his soldiers’ shields as protection. After the victory, Petronas strongly praised the saint: see Theoph. Cont. 180.13–181.4, and 181.11–184.11; Skylitzes 100.27–32. In all likelihood it was not a matter of a different person, but actually Antony the Younger, called John here either in reference to his name before taking his vows, or owing to confusion with his spiritual father John. It is less likely that the historians had identified our saint with a later monk, as in PmbZ 22966 or PmbZ 23246.

28 Halkin 1944: chap. 16.
30 Halkin 1944: chap. 17–18, see Theoph. Cont. 4.25 (183–184), where the saint predicts his own death and that of Petronas shortly thereafter. We owe the chronology of the life of Antony to Halkin, who starts with the date of the saint’s death: see Halkin 1944: 195–197. This chronology has been widely accepted: see Tanner 1997.
31 Halkin 1944: chap. 10–18.
32 As regards the different treatment of this episode in the sources preserved, see Gouillard 1967: 124–125; Karlin-Hayter 2001; Varona Codesto 2010: 77–80 and 201–204; Brubaker and Haldon 2011: 448–450.
34 Van den Gheyn 1899: 249 onwards.
36 Van den Gheyn 1899: 242–246. Note that in the hagiography of the saints of Lesbos, the Stylite Symeon is the only one responsible for this absolution, to the detriment of the empress Theodora and the future patriarch Methodios, whose divine visions and intercessions for his soul are brushed aside: see van den Gheyn 1899: chap. 26, 242.35–243.2; Karlin-Hayter 2006.
40 Rosenqvist 1986: chap. 2.18–24. This *vita* is dated at the end of the tenth century (c. 980: Rosenqvist 1986: XXVIII), revealing the success of Theophilos’ absolution process.
41 Grieson 1962: 53; Symeon Logothetes 248–249; Pseudo-Symeon, 681. Karlin-Hayter 1991: 382 n. 41, wonders whether Constantine’s corpse might have served as an exchange demanded by the ecclesiastical sectors for conceding absolution to Theophilos.
42 Markopoulos 1998.
43 As Afinogenov 1999b and 2004b proved, basing himself on the long quotes that George includes from the *Refutatio et Eversio* by the patriarch Nicephorus, from his rejection of Thomas the Slav and from his ignorance of the fate of the forty-two martyrs of Amorion, executed in 845.
Among which is also the *Epistula synodica ad Theophilum* (*BHG* 1386); see Markopoulos 1998: 41 and 48; Munitiz 1997; Gauer 1994; Signes Codoñer 2014: 367–408.

Edited by Regel 1891: 19–39; Combebis 1648; Afinogenov 2004a.


The traditional edition of *Vita Theodorae* by Regel 1891: 1–43, was surpassed by Markopoulos 1983. There is an English translation by Vinson 1998. See *SynaxCP* 458–460 (11 February).


Regel 1891: 33–35. An interesting precedent legitimised this conversion: the iconoclast patriarch Paul (780–784) forswore iconoclasm when he fell ill and saw death coming, retiring to the monastery of Phloros to die in peace: see Theoph. 457,14–17; Efthymiadis 1998: chap. 8–11. His repentance won him an entry in the *Synaxarion of Constantinople*, where he is remembered on 31 August: see *SynaxCP* 933.53 and following; Lilie 1999: 271–276. For Paul, see *PmbZ* 5829; *PBE* 1: Paulos 4.

Afinogenov 1999a.

One of them, *BHG* 1734a, has been edited by Halkin 1988b.


Regel 1891: 40–43; Combebis 1648: 739A–743A.


Regel 1891: 43.

Kazhdan’s proposal, according to which the *Vita Theodorae* came before the narrative that describes Theophilos’ absolution, is hardly defensible: see Kazhdan 1986: 154.


Vasilevski and Nikitin 1905; Brubaker and Haldon 2001: 219.


Vasilevski and Nikitin 1905: 11.22–25.


Thus, the proposal to date the writing of the texts concerning Theophilos’ rehabilitation in the tenth century is too late. The justification by Kazhdan 1986: 154, who sees in them a counter-propaganda tool against the policies of Constantine VII, is not convincing. The view of Markopoulos 1998: 47–48, that the case of Theophilos is similar to that of Basil I, in which there is a gradual improvement in his image, receiving more and more praise, clashes with the hagiographic testimonies about Theophilos: see below. For his part, Afinogenov 2004a: 84, situates them vaguely at the end of the ninth century, on the basis that interpolations already existed in the tenth century.

Van den Gheyn 1894a; Sullivan 1998.


*Vita Demetriani* (*BHG* 495), see Grégoire 1907: 221.153; *Vita Ioannis. Metaphr.* (*BHG* 937), see *PG* 116: 81B–D (chap. 47) and 84D (chap. 50); *Vita Theodori grati* (*BHG* 1746), see *PG* 116: 668C; 672A; 681B; *Synax. Josephi hymnographi* (*BHG* 947b), see *SynaxCP* 582.19–20; *Commentarius de imagine Deiparae τῆς Πορταϊτίσσης* (*BHG* 1070), see Bury 1897: 91.


Also used, for example, to invoke a spirit or deceased saint; see Palladius, Historia Lausiaca (recensio G), 60, 12–15: καθεσθεῖσα προσκαλεῖται τὸν μάρτυρα λέγουσα·
"Εὐλόγησόν μου τὰ βρώματα, ἄγε Κόλλουθε, καὶ συνόδευσόν μοι ταῖς προσευχαῖς σου" (Bartelink 1974).


Halkin 1988a; Treadgold 1982; Brubaker and Haldon 2001: 217; see also SynaxCP 877.56–57.

Franchi de’ Cavalieri and Hagiographi Bollandiani 1902: 14–15, where this manuscript is dated to the eleventh century. For Ihor Ševčenko, it corresponds to the twelfth century: see Treadgold 1982: 237 n. 2. See also Canart and Peri 1970: 671.

For the monastery at Prinkipo dedicated to the Theotokos see Janin 1975: 69.

De cer. 2.42; version L of the Catalogus sepulchrornum.


Which shows dynamics similar to those of family cults: see Talbot 1996; Métivier 2012; Flusin 2012; Kaplan 2013.
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De adm. imp. 13.

For a recent study on this subject, see Kaldellis 2015.

Dagron 1996.


Ševčenko 1992; Magdalino 2013.


Featherstone 2004b.

Leipzig University, Rep.l, 17 (olim Mun. 28).


De cer. 1, Preface, trans. Moffatt and Tall 2012: 5.


De adm. imp. 13.

Vita Basilii 2–4.

Vita Basilii 1.

INTRODUCTION

28 De cer. 1, Appendix, trans. Moffatt and Tall 2012: 455.
29 De cer. 2.19, trans Moffatt and Tall 2012: 607; McCormick 1986: 161.
30 Skylitzes, Reign of Constantine VII, 6; De cer. 2.15; Nikephoros, Short History 9.
32 Ivory plaque with Christ crowning Constantine VII, State Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts (Moscow), Inv. II-162.
33 On the rise of cults of military saints, see White 2013; also Oikonomidès 1995.
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* Research for this chapter was carried out in the context of the project: ‘Worlds Apart? Identity and Otherness in Late Byzantine Perceptions of the West’ (SH6–1345). The research project was implemented within the framework of the Action ‘Supporting Postdoctoral Researchers’ of the Operational Program ‘Education and Lifelong Learning’ (Action’s Beneficiary: General Secretariat for Research and Technology), and was co-financed by the European Social Fund (ESF) and the Greek State. I would like to thank Shaun Tougher, Anthony Kaldellis, and the anonymous reviewer for their helpful comments and suggestions.
2 Page 2008 : 46–52, passim (quotation at 47).
3 Stouraitis 2014: 214.
6 Orationes 17 (176–185), 13 (120–128) and 16 (170–175) respectively.
7 Orationes 14 (129–147). For the dating of the oration, see van Dieten 1971: 59, 146–152. After escaping the sack of Constantinople, Choniates found refuge in Selymbria (April 1204–June 1206), before briefly returning to Constantinople for a few months (July 1206–December 1206); from there he moved to Nicaea at the end of 1206 or the beginning of 1207: van Dieten 1971: 44–47; Simpson 2006: 194.
8 Orationes 15 (147–189).
10 See also the reflections by John Vanderspoel in this volume.
11 On the advisory role of oratory in the Late Byzantine era, see Angelov 2003; Angelov 2007: 62–64, 161–180; Toth 2007: 442–443. Niketas Choniates himself had subtly tried to advise against Isaac II’s policy towards the Third Crusade and to make Isaac reconsider his relations with Saladin, in an oration delivered in the emperor’s presence (or at any rate in the court) back in 1190 – as argued by Angelov 2006: 55–65.
The term *silention* or *selention* initially referred to a solemn gathering of the higher dignitaries of state. However, from as early as the tenth/eleventh centuries it was also used to denote the customary speech on fasting delivered to the senate by the emperor (often ghost-written), on the first Sunday of Lent: see Christophilopulu 1951: 82–83; Stavrídou-Zafraka 1991: 99 (with bibliography).

For the dating of the oration see van Diemen 1971: 59, 141–142. For the dating of Theodore’s acclamation and coronation, see Macrides 2007: 83–84; Giarenis 2008: 46–49.


See e.g. *Orationes*: 128.9–33, 139.1–12, 147.1–15, 160.6–21, 174.12–175.34.


For the resurrection theme, see Giarenis 2008: 313–316.

The versions of Choniates’ *History*, as can be discerned from the surviving manuscripts, are laid out by van Diemen in the introduction of his edition (*Historia*: xix–ci, esp. lvi–lii and xcii–ci), and discussed in detail by Simpson 2006; Simpson 2013: 68–124.


Giarenis 2008: 100–101. According to the information provided by Geoffrey of Villehardouin (Faral 1961: pars. 487–490), the truce was agreed between 15 April and 24 June 1207.

Conflict between the two sides began again only after Henry’s alliance with the Seljuk sultan Kai-Khusraw and the latter’s aggression against Nicaea in 1210–1211. Besides, the Latin emperor was busy in the meantime dealing with the Lombard revolt in Greece. See, for example, Gardner 1912: 78–84; Setton 1976–84, vol. 1: 27–29; Wolff 1969: 206–208; Giarenis 2008: 100–102.

The pope’s response, dated 17 March 1208, summarizes the contents of Theodore’s letter, which has not survived: Hageneder et al., eds. 1964–, vol. 11: no. 44 (47). While denouncing the Latin outrages against Byzantium, Laskaris evidently suggested a lasting settlement between the Latin empire and Nicaea. Theodore even proposed common Byzantine-Latin action against the ‘Ishmaelites’.


For the relations between Nicaea and the Seljuks in this period, see Giarenis 2008: 59–89, and Korobeinikov 2014: 111–169; A discussion of the truce in Giarenis 2008: 107–111, who argues that Nicaea effectively became a ‘hostage’ to the Latin empire after the treaty, as the terms divided its territories in two separate parts, difficult to
communicate with each other; cf. Angold 1975a: 111–112. Giarenis 2008: 109, dates a preliminary truce to 1212 and a more permanent peace signed in 1214; van Tricht 2001: 413–417, 221–227, has dated the truce to 1213, while earlier literature generally accepted 1214 (e.g. Lock 1995: 55–56); cf. Macrides 2007: 152 n.12.

29 Theodore’s marriage was denounced by the metropolitan of Naupaktos, John Apokaukos (see Vasilievsky 1896: 265–267, no. 15), while the later plan (c. 1221) for a marriage between Theodore’s daughter, Eudokia, and the new Latin emperor, Robert of Courtenay, was strongly resisted by patriarch Manuel I Sarantenos: Giarenis 2008: 111–116 and 148–149. For the marriage diplomacy between Nicaea and the Latin empire, see also Angold 2011: 50–54. The ‘western’ turn of Theodore’s policy was also evident in the five-year commercial treaty with the Venetians granting them trading privileges in Nicaean territories, which was signed in August 1219, and in the plan for a Byzantine delegation to be sent to the papacy in 1220 (even though these developments took place after Niketas’ death and therefore are not central to the argument made here); see Nicol 1988: 163–166; Stavridou-Zafraka 1991: 57–58; Giarenis 2008: 132–138. The treaty with the Venetians in Tafel and Thomas 1856–57, vol. 2: 205–207; commentary in Hendrickx 2004. For the call to the clergy of Epiros to participate in a synod that would send an embassy to Rome (and the Epirote reactions), see Nicol 1957: 86–87.

30 For the dating of the revision, see Simpson 2006: 211–213, 220; Simpson 2013: 76–77. Niketas’ deep dissatisfaction with his circumstances in Nicaea is reflected in the last part of his revised History (Historia: 644–645) as well as in several of his surviving letters (nos. 2–5, 7, 11 in Orationes: 202–208, 209–211, 216–217).

31 Niketas famously described the ‘polyarchy’ in the east as ‘a three-headed monster’ comprising Theodore Laskaris, Manuel Maurozomes and David Komnenos of Pontus: Historia: 625–626. See also below for Niketas’ criticism of the inefficient and self-seeking lords who failed to face the Latins.


33 As already noted above, this chapter sprang from my postdoctoral research project on Late Byzantine identity. These points are addressed in greater detail in the monograph which is currently under preparation.


36 Orationes: 127.18–31: ὁ δ’ ἐντελὴς μισθαποδότης Θεὸς [...] τοῦ ὑπὲρ τοῦ καλοῦ ζῆλον τῆς βασιλείας μου προσδεξάμενος, εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν ταύτισσαν δωρησάμενος· ὡς ἐκεῖνος τῆς Ἰούδα πρώτως ἐπέβη φυλῆς, εἶτα καὶ τοῦ πατρός Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ή βασιλεία μου ἐς δεῦρο τῶν πρὸς ἀκτῖνα Ῥωμαίων ὑπεριζάνουσα πόλεων πέποιθεν ὡς ὁ πρωτότοκον θέμενος τὸν Δαβίδ, ὑψηλὸν παρὰ τοῖς βασιλεύσι τῆς γῆς, καὶ προσεπιδοὺς ὕστερον κληρούχησιν καὶ τῆς Σιὼν τὴν κατάσχεσιν, αὐτὸς καὶ τὰ τῆς βασιλείας μου κατευθύνων διαβήματα τε καὶ διαβούλια πατεῖν ὄψιν ὦφεοιν καὶ σκορπίων ἐξουσίαν χαρίσατο [...] .


See Orationes: 134.15–20 (ἐκεῖνα τὰ Δαυιδικά σοι προσφώνοις [...] εἰς βασιλεία χρίωσαν αὐτοκράτορα ὡς τὸν ἐξ Ἰσραήλ ὑποψήλαντες [...]. See also Orationes: 143.7–9 (ἐκεῖνα τὰ Δαυιδικά σοι προσφώνοις [...]. See, for example, Orationes: 127.1–11: ὁ δὲ πάντα συνηνέχθη τε καὶ κατεπράχθη τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου, οὐχ ἵνα κέρδος καρπώσωμαι ἴδιον (οὐχ οὕτως ἐγὼ πλέον ἵλαρχος ἀλλ' ἵνα τῶν ἑῴων ἀποσοβήσαιμι πόλεων τὸ κατὰ πᾶσαν εὐπέτειαν τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν ὑπεισιὸν ἐπικράτειαν ὅσα καὶ νέος ἀκρίδων καὶ κεῖρον ταύτην καὶ ληιζόμενον ἐπιζύριον ἐπάρατον σύνταγμα). See, for example, Orationes: 127.1–11: ὁ δὲ πάντα συνηνέχθη τε καὶ κατεπράχθη τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου, οὐχ ἵνα κέρδος καρπώσωμαι ἴδιον (οὐχ οὕτως ἐγὼ πλέον ἵλαρχος ἀλλ' ἵνα τῶν ἑもらい ἀποσοβήσαιμι πόλεων τὸ κατὰ πᾶσαν εὐπέτειαν τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν ὑπεισιὸν ἐπικράτειαν ὅσα καὶ νέος ἀκρίδων καὶ κεῖρον ταύτην καὶ ληιζόμενον ἐπιζύριον ἐπάρατον σύνταγμα). And similar views and comments in Historia: 625–626, 637–639, 561.19–22, 644.54–61. Orationes: 130.34–131.3. Although applying such terms to the pre-modern world is fraught with danger, there have been several sober discussions of Nicaean ‘patriotism’: Irmscher 1970 and 1972; Angold 1975b. An excellent discussion of the wider question of ‘nationalism’ in the Byzantine empire is by Magdalino 1991. Cf. Angelov 2005: 299–303, who speaks of ‘the emergence of elements of Hellenic proto-nationalism’ in Nicaea. For recent discussions of Byzantine identity see notes 2–4 above. See, for example, the striking condemnation of Manuel Maurozomes for allying with the Seljuks against his compatriots (and note also the reference to language as another element of group identification). Orationes: 136.35–137.7: ‘he [Maurozomes] who is connected to us by race, but in his thoughts he is a foreigner and someone who is and has proven himself an immoderate enemy of his own fatherland [...] and along with Persian [i.e. Turkish] forces he, who only knows how to be brave against his own people, has ravaged those of the same language who were not of one mind with him, as if they were of a foreign race’ (ὁ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ γένος ἡμῖν συναπτόμενος, ταῖς δὲ γνώμαις ἀλλοεθνὴς καὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ πατρίδος ἀκρατὴς πολέμιος καὶ ὢν καὶ δεικνύμενος [...] καὶ μετὰ δυνάμεων Περσικῶν ἐπιὼν ὁ κατὰ μόνων τῶν οἰκείων εἰδὼς ἀνδρίζεσθαι ἐκεῖρε τὸ μὴ συμφέροντον ὡς ἀλλόφυλον). See also Orationes: 126.13–19; Historia: 618.3–4, 634.87, 625.24–39, etc. Regarding the emphasis on ‘race’, cf. the observation by Shawcross 2011: 31. Orationes: 132.4–6: ἡὔξω κατὰ τὸν ἐκ Ταρσοῦ θεοκήρυκα τῆς κοινῆς προκινδυνεύως ἐλευθερίας καὶ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ὑπέρ τῶν ὁμογενῶν καὶ συμφύλων σοι. This is an allusion to Romans 9:3 (ἡὕχομην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα), but the adaptation of terminology is notable: the ‘brothers and relatives of the flesh’ of the original is replaced by ‘those of the same genos and phylon’. See Orationes: 147.16–17 (Ταῦτα ἡ γαλοῦχός σοι πόλις καὶ κοινὴ τῶν Ῥωμαίων πατρὶς οἰμώζουσα καὶ κοπτομένη φρίσι, βασιλεύ) and 128.9–33 (εἰ τοίνυν οὕτω πολιτευόμεθα [...] τῶν πατρίδων αὐτῆς λαβώμεθα, ὃν ἡμαρτόντες ἀπεσαράσθημεν). For the use of the term patris in the wider sense of ‘fatherland’ (rather than ‘hometown’), see also Orationes: 130.36, 132.3, 137.1, 160.1, 184.31; Historia: 601.72, 637.35. Historia: 635, apparatus criticus, l. 16; cf. Historia: 634.87 (ἐμοῖς τε καὶ τῶν ψηφισμάτων διαπραγμάτευσα). For the conflict between Nicaea and Trebizond in 1205–1206, see Giarenis 2008: 167–173. Orationes: 142–144 (quotations at 143.7–8 and 143.29–33).
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Chapter 14

1 For the dating of the History see Nicol 1968: 100.
7 Kantakouzenos 3.64, 72, 74, ed. Schopen 1828–37, vol. 2: 396, 440, 447, 461.
8 Dölger 1961.
13 Loenertz 1953.
14 Korobeinikov 2004: 59–62. He remarks that the name of the biblical hero Samson is a mistranslation of the word ṣamšām.
CHAPTER 15

1 I am grateful to Amanda Luyster, Naomi Pitamber, Shaun Tougher, and the anonymous reader, each of whom contributed substantially to the improvement of this chapter.

2 These mosaics were painstakingly conserved and documented following their rediscovery in the early twentieth century. Regarding this effort, see Whittemore 1933–52. Also see Mango 1962. For reassessment of the mosaic programme at Hagia Sophia, see Cormack 1981, and additional bibliography noted below.

3 Regarding the sixth-century phase of Hagia Sophia, see Mainstone 1988: esp. 185–235.
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4 For discussion of Hagia Sophia as a centre and symbol of imperial authority throughout and beyond the Byzantine era, see Mark and Čakmak 1992; Nelson 2004.

5 Constantine Porphyrogennetos’ Book of Ceremonies is translated by Moffat and Tall 2012. This translation includes a reprint of the modern edition of the text by Reiske and Leich 1829–30. On the nature and purpose of the Book of Ceremonies, see especially McCormick 1985; Cameron 1987; the essays collected in TM 13, 2000; Holmes 2010. See also the contribution by Prerona Prasad in this volume (Chapter 12).

6 The Book of Ceremonies does not mention any of the monumental works of art in Hagia Sophia. However, their absence should not be taken as an indication that the decorations were not present at the time of the compilation of the text. Even the apse mosaic depicting the Virgin Mary, which is described in a homily dating to 867, is not acknowledged in the Book of Ceremonies.


8 For a notable exception to this tendency, see Lidov 2004.

9 For discussion of this idea, see James 2004.

10 I evoke here Trilling 1998.


12 Now a commonplace in art history and related disciplines, the phrase ‘period eye’ originated in Baxandall 1972: 29–108.

13 On this point, see especially James 2004.


15 Regarding the aesthetics of Hagia Sophia, see Webb 1999; Pentcheva 2011; Schibille 2014.

16 Russian Primary Chronicle, ed. and trans. Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor 1953: 111; ed. Karsky 1926–28: col. 107. The manuscript on which the edition and translation are based is available in an online facsimile: expositions.nlr.ru/LaurentianCodex/ (accessed 30 September 2016). The Rus’ian account also notes that the emperor and patriarch conspired to present a captivating performance for the delegation by burning incense, singing hymns, donning sacerdotal robes, and assembling the full ecclesiastical retinue. The emperor accompanied the delegation, serving as their personal guide around the Great Church and providing them with impressive gifts upon their departure. The Chronicle evinces how the awe-inspiring spectacle of Byzantine liturgical ceremonial was a powerful tool that the patriarch and emperor skilfully deployed to potent and precise effect.

17 James 2004: 525.

18 Regarding the pose of proskynesis in Byzantine art and ritual, see Spatharakis 1974: 190–205; Cutler 1975: 53–91 (both of whom summarise the earlier bibliography); and Vojvodić 2010, who cites additional depictions of proskynesis in Byzantine art not noted by Spatharakis and Cutler.

19 For a detailed account of the emperor’s garments, see Hawkins 1968: 162–163.

20 Typically, two categories of evidence are cited to date the tympanum mosaic: style and the identity of the imperial figure. The style of the mosaic over the Imperial Door is often compared to other mosaics in the building that date to the late ninth century, such as that of the archangel Gabriel in the arch leading to the apse. As Cormack 1981: 138–141, notes, however, the body of comparative material for the mosaic over the Imperial Door is extremely limited, casting doubt over any argument that relies too heavily on stylistic evidence. A thorough reanalysis of the style of the mosaic is needed, including careful consideration of how reliable such evidence can be for dating the work. This task is, however, beyond the scope of the present chapter. Theories regarding the identity of the emperor are stymied by the fact that the figure is not named by inscription. From the time of the rediscovery of the mosaic, Whittemore 1938: 220, associated the imperial figure with Leo VI (886–912), perceiving affinity with imperial portraits of his reign. Mango
1962: 96–97, further supported this identification; he asserted that the figure must represent a ktetor (founder) of the building and marshalled evidence for Leo VI's additions to the church. Brubaker 2010: 60, also endorsed the identification of the figure as Leo VI, but emphasised that the absence of identifying inscriptions makes the image ‘about the emperor as an institution . . . not about any particular living emperor as a donor’. Like Brubaker, I interpret the absence of identifying inscriptions as an indication that the patron(s) of the mosaic wished the image to represent not a particular emperor but rather a perennial image of imperial authority.

21 Grabar 1936: 100–106. Also see Gavrilović 1979; Cormack 2000: 114, 116. Regarding the association of the figure with the portrait type of Leo VI, see n.20, above.

22 Grabar 1936: 101, proposed that the figure’s pose simply mirrored ritual observance of triple proskynesis performed by the emperor at this location in the course of the imperial liturgy as recorded in the Book of Ceremonies.

23 Oikonomidès 1976. Oikonomidès’ interpretation has become deeply rooted in the scholarship and continues to be endorsed today. See, for instance, Dagron 2003a: 114–124. Lidov 2004 supports Oikonomidès’ association of the image with imperial penance, but proposes a different date and motivation for the installation of the mosaic. He sees it instead as continuing themes of repentance and divine forgiveness that feature in two important icons that were brought to Hagia Sophia by Leo VI and hung on either side of the Imperial Door; he proposes that Leo VI installed the mosaic during his lifetime.

24 These events are recounted in the life of patriarch Euthymios; see Karlin-Hayter 1970: 73–78. Also see Tougher 1997: 152–163.


28 This range of possibilities is surveyed by Cutler 1975: 53–91.

29 Scholars who have raised doubt about Oikonomidès’ reading of this image as one of imperial subjugation under patriarchal authority include Cormack 1981: 139–141, and 1994: 245–251; Brubaker 2010: 50–51, 55–57; Gavrilović 1979.

30 My interpretation of the emperor’s status as a liminal figure who acts as a hinge between the courts of heaven and earth is indebted to Henry Maguire, who has articulated the emperor’s unique ability to move between the ‘interpenetrating’ hierarchies of the earthly and heavenly courts and has drawn attention to the conception of the emperor in Byzantine art and texts as Christ-like in the sense that he possessed an ambiguous nature that vacillates between human and divine qualities: Maguire 1989: 224–229, and 1997. Also see Woodfin 2010. My argument is distinguished from these studies, however, by the degree to which it correlates imperial iconography with imperial ceremonial, and for the way in which it shows how ideas of the emperor’s unique status were amplified through his physical juxtaposition with prominent public images in Hagia Sophia that expressed the ineffable, taxis-defying qualities of Christ and the Virgin Mary.

31 With respect to an understanding of the middle Byzantine emperor’s priest-like status, my study has benefitted from the foundational work of Dagron 1996, trans. 2003a. As outlined further below, I differ from Dagron, however, regarding the ecclesiastical implications for imperial authority generated through the liturgy at Hagia Sophia and in my interpretation of the imperial-ecclesiastical power dynamic established by the narthex mosaic at the Great Church.

32 Regarding the rigidly stratified and highly competitive nature of middle Byzantine society – as well as the possibility for social mobility that these conditions generated – see Kazhdan and McCormick 1997; Magdalino 2009.
33 With respect to the possibility that contemporary viewers may have seen the imperial figure’s pose as one that simultaneously evoked imperial penance (and redemption) as well as honour, I endorse the argument of Cutler 1975: 66, that *proskynesis* could be employed as a ‘compound image’, that intentionally drew from and productively merged more than one category of associations. A similar opinion has been voiced by Kähler and Mango 1967: 54, who note that ‘it is characteristic of Byzantine sacred iconography that it should admit various overtones of interpretation . . . the primary meaning of the mosaic . . . need not be its only meaning’. Indeed, as Lidov 2004 has argued, an imperial capacity for penance and redemption need not have been associated with a specific historical event and instead could be promoted as an abiding imperial virtue.

34 In this regard, my interpretation resonates with that of Brubaker 2010: 60, who posits that the mosaic over the Imperial Door should be understood as a ‘generic’ statement of imperial ideology ‘rather than a direct response to an immediately pressing historical circumstance’. In addition, I agree with Brubaker 2010: 60, who emphasises the deep significance of the main portals of Hagia Sophia to the symbolic meaning of the imperial liturgy: ‘the Imperial Door in the narthex and the Beautiful Door in the vestibule were imperial ceremonial spaces: sites of transition, transaction and of super-personal imperial identity’.

35 The *Book of Ceremonies* was the product of compilation and revision over time with the result that the chronology of different sections of the text is varied and complex. However, the chapters of the manual that I analyse here are dated to Constantine VII’s reign. Furthermore, they show evidence of updating, which supports the view that they reflect imperial rituals as they were practised in the mid-tenth century. For the dating of the *Book of Ceremonies*, see Bury 1907; Featherstone 2004; Moffat and Tall 2012: xxv–xxvi.

36 *De cer.* 1, Preface, trans. Moffatt and Tall 2012: 3–5. See also Chapter 12 by Prerona Prasad in this volume.

37 On the Chrysotriklinos, see Dagron 2003b; Featherstone 2005.


39 *De cer.* 1.1.7: ἡ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καθεζομένη, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 7, who amend ‘θεοείκελος’ (‘godlike’) to ‘θεανδρείκελος’ (‘as both God and man’).

40 The eight points at which the emperor performs *proskynesis* are as follows: in the church of the Theotokos – referred to as ‘the first founded’ (τῳ πρωτοκτίστῳ ναῷ) – where he received candles from the *praipositoi* and then made triple *proskynesis* in thanks to God: *De cer.* 1.1.7 and 1.1.8, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 7–8. In the adjoining chapel of the Holy Trinity the emperor performed triple *proskynesis* two times: in the sanctuary and again in front of the relics kept there: *De cer.* 1.1.8, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 8. Subsequently he entered the church of St. Stephen and made triple *proskynesis* in the sanctuary and then *proskynesis* again in front of the cross of Constantine: *De cer.* 1.1.8 and 1.1.9, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 8–9. After passing into the First Schole (the Old Mint) the emperor made triple *proskynesis* before ‘a very beautiful cross made of silver’ (ὁ ἔξ ἀργύρου κατεσκευασμένος περικυκλαλής σταυρός): *De cer.* 1.1.11, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 11. Subsequently, in ‘the Lamps’, the emperor made triple *proskynesis* before another silver cross: *De cer.* 1.1.12, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 12. Finally, at the entrance to the church of the Holy Apostles, the emperor again performed triple *proskynesis*: *De cer.* 1.1.13, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 13.

41 These three moments are as follows: After the initial imperial prayer was completed before the image of Christ in the Chrysotriklinos, the first set of courtiers to greet the emperor, the *praipositoi*, made *proskynesis* to him: *De cer.* 1.1.7, trans. Moffat and
Tall 2012: 7. After the emperor donned his regalia and proceeded to the hall of the Augousteus, the ‘magistroi, proconsuls, patricians, strategoi, holders of high office, and frontier commanders’ made proskynesis before him: De cer. 1.1.10, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 10. Then the emperor and his entourage continue to the Onopodion, at which location ‘the droungarios of the Watch and the droungarios of the fleet’ and ‘the imperial spatharioi . . . the magistroi and the rest fall down in obeisance [πίπτουσι] there’; De cer. 1.1.10, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 10.

42 The Book of Ceremonies does not mention the image of Christ Chalkites that was positioned above the gate. This icon played an important role in the Iconoclastic controversy, being removed and reinstated as the imperial and patriarchal position vacillated. On this image and the building it adorned, see Mango 1959: 108–142 and 170–174.


44 De cer. 1.1.14, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 14. In the initial publication of this mosaic after its rediscovery, Whittemore 1933–52, vol. 2: 30–31, attributed the work to the late tenth century based on comparison with comparable images in other media as well as palaeographic analysis. However, as Brubaker has documented, the basis of Whittemore’s attribution is debatable, if not incorrect. Synthesising the piecemeal evidence that other scholars have noted regarding the date of the mosaic, she dates it to the first half of the tenth century based on several factors, including that: the title ‘Mother of God’ for the Virgin Mary first appeared in conjunction with imperial images on coins of Leo VI, and the boldness of the inscription in the mosaic suggests it may correspond chronologically with the public, numismatic advent of that terminology; the phrases used to characterise Constantine and Justinian in the inscriptions are also attested in the mid-tenth-century Book of Ceremonies; the type of loros worn by the two emperors parallels the form found in coins of the late ninth- to mid-tenth century; and some technical details (including the angled placement of the tesserae and the compensation for optical distortion in the proportions of the figures) suggest a late ninth- or early tenth-century date, while the placement of the tesserae for the halos in a predominantly linear arrangement suggests a date in the first half of the tenth century. Brubaker raises the possibility that the mosaic over the Beautiful Door was commissioned by Constantine VII, suggesting that it post-dates the mosaic over the Imperial Door, which she associates with the patronage of Leo VI. See Brubaker 2010: 42–43, 46–52, and 60–61. It must be emphasised, however, that the sequence of the mosaics over the Imperial and Beautiful Doors is uncertain.

46 For recent discussion of these mosaics, see Brubaker 2010: 43–55 and 58–61.

47 Regarding apse mosaic and suggestions for its relationship to the liturgy and the patriarch’s appearance within these rituals, see Teteriatnikov 2004–2005.

48 In drawing a connection between the Beautiful and Imperial Doors, I follow the lead of Brubaker 2010: 59, who states ‘it is increasingly clear that we need to consider the Imperial Door in the narthex and the Beautiful Door in the vestibule as pendants to each other, made at different times but working together to present a coherent message’. Brubaker also emphasises the ‘transactional’ nature of the ritual activities that surrounded these two images and the ‘liminal’ nature of the doors (and vestibules) themselves.

49 During the imperial coronation ceremony, however, the crown and chlamys were bestowed upon the emperor at the ambo, with the result that, on this occasion, the emperor wore his full regalia within the church: De cer. 1.38.192–193, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 192–193.
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53 See n.40 and n.41 above.
56 Barber 1993: 14. Barber 1993: 15, emphasises, however, that this is only a ‘projection’ of ‘unmediated presence’, a point made clear when the emperor performed proskynesis beneath the mosaic during the imperial liturgy: ‘The presence of the emperor below would emphasize his absence from the icon above, marking this as a depiction rather than a re-presentation of something wholly absent’.
57 On this point, see Maguire 1989: 224–228.
58 De cer. 1.1.7, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 7. See n.31 above.
59 Breckenridge 1980–1981. This iconographic type was also employed widely in Macedonian-era coinage, solidifying its association with this dynasty. For the numismatic evidence, see Grierson 1973, vol. 3: 154–158. For the argument in favour of seeing a visually orchestrated parallel between the Chrysotriklinos and the tympanum over the Imperial Door, also see Lidov 2004.
64 For discussion of the archangels’ iconography as indicative of their overlapping roles in the heavenly and earthly courts, see Maguire 1989: 222–224, and 1997: 250 and 255–258.
65 Another potent visual juxtaposition may have been orchestrated as the emperor passed through the Imperial Door into the naos. As early as 1200, Russian sources attest to an image of Christ Chalkites on the western wall of the naos in the space above the Imperial Door: Majeska 1971, and 1984: 28–29, 130–131, 210–212. Presumably this depiction repeated the iconographic type that appeared above the Chalke Gate (the aforementioned ceremonial portal of the imperial palace). Neither image survives today, and the date at which the Christ Chalkites was added to the decorative programme of the Great Church is unknown. Majeska 1971: 293, proposes that the Chalke image probably was added to Hagia Sophia in 843, after the second period of iconoclasm. Lidov 2004 suggests that it could have been installed during the late ninth- to mid-tenth century, in the same period during which other figural decorations were introduced to the building. In any case, by 1200, if not earlier, through the repetition of the Christ Chalkites at key portals of the imperial palace and the Great Church, these spaces were bound together. As the emperor walked into the naos and beneath the icon of Christ Chalkites, the audience already within the naos witnessed a ritual tableau echoing his earlier passage through the Chalke Gate of the palace. Each portal marked a potent transition between qualitatively different spaces: in the case of the Chalke Gate, from the explicitly imperial zone of the palace into the semi-public zone of the Augustaion; in the case of the Imperial Door, from the semi-profane zone of the narthex into the explicitly sacred zone of the naos. In addition, the juxtaposition of the emperor with an image of
Christ above each door resonated with the visual parallel staged between Christ and the emperor in the Chrysothriklines when the emperor assumed his seat beneath the image of Christ enthroned.

Majeska 1997: 2, begins his analysis at the point when the emperor arrives at the church. I reach a different conclusion regarding the underlying message of the ritual performances at Hagia Sophia by attending to the fact that the Book of Ceremonies recounts each procession as commencing in the palace at the Chrysothriklines.

Majeska 1997: 5–9. Majeska observes that the imperial coronation ceremony, as prescribed in the Book of Ceremonies and the Euchologion of the Great Church (the latter of which draws from manuscripts dating as early as the late eighth century), also casts the emperor in semi-ecclesiastical terms. Aspects of the ritual immediately recalled the ordination ceremony of individuals entering holy orders. In particular, both the coronation and ordination ceremonies transpired during the ‘little’ or ‘first’ entrance and were performed by the patriarch. Furthermore, the culminating actions of crowning and/or robing were localised at the ambo and accompanied by the acclamation ‘Worthy!’ (Ἄξιος!). Following the imperial vestment ceremony, the newly crowned emperor continued to perform actions that were normally reserved for members of the ecclesiastical orders: he participated in the second ‘great entrance’; he was verbally commemorated by members of the clergy in the same way that they recognised the celebrating bishop or patriarch; he exchanged the kiss of peace with the patriarch; and he received the eucharist not as a typical layman would (with the wine and bread together on a spoon), but instead as a priest or deacon did (taking the bread in his hand from the patriarch and drinking directly from a chalice held by the patriarch). At the same time, the emperor was distinguished from members of the ecclesiastical orders in several respects: he took communion not within the sanctuary at the altar (a location reserved for the patriarch, bishops, priests, and deacons), but just outside the entrance to the sanctuary (in the area where the lower clergy received communion, although the lower clergy received communion combined, like laypeople). Majeska 1997: 2–4; De cer. 1.38, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 191–196; Euchologion sive ritual graecorum, ed. Goar 1960. Of particular note, the coronation ceremony ascribed to the emperor a special status among laymen, because he traversed the ceremonial categories that usually distinguished members of the holy orders. Still, he did not join these ecclesiastical ranks in a clear-cut way. Instead he occupied clerical ranks ambiguously, in a manner that disrupted their usual distinctions, but did not resolve into a clear assignment of clerical rank. The point of the coronation ceremony was not to align the emperor with the ordained, but rather to place him in a unique situation whereby his unresolved status imbued him with power because in an exceptional fashion, he superseded the normal categories of Byzantine social order.

De cer. 1.1.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 15. Subsequently it is noted that previously the emperor did not enter the sanctuary during the liturgy commemorating the Feast of Orthodoxy, but that ‘now’ he does. This suggests that changes in the emperor’s role – which were recent enough for the compiler of the Book of Ceremonies to comment on their novelty – emphasised a clerical association by admitting the emperor to the sanctuary: De cer. 1.28.158–159, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 158–159.

De cer. 1.1.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 15.

De cer. 1.1.16, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 16.


Majeska 1997: 7. The commemoration that the clergy say to one another as they enter the sanctuary is: ‘May the Lord God remember you in his kingdom.’ See Taft 1975: 241–242.
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75 The absence of his crown can be understood to contribute to his ambiguous status at this juncture in the ceremony; by laying only partial claim to the insignia of his office, he occupies a liminal category between laity and clergy.


77 Majeska 1997: 8.


80 Majeska 1997: 8. Regarding the emperor’s semi-ecclesiastical identity during the liturgy at Hagia Sophia and the ritual of imperial communion, also see Taft 2001: 9–13 and 27.


82 Within the substantial body of scholarship on these mosaics, I highlight below recent studies that consider the social and historical significance of these mosaics in relation to the Great Church and the ecclesiastical and imperial authorities who gathered there.

83 As noted by Brubaker 2010: 39.

84 Four circles surround the figure and are inscribed with monograms or regular text; together they read: Κύριε Βο(ή)θει (τῷ σῷ) δού(λ)ῷ ὀρδοδόξῳ πιστῷ δεσπ(ό)τη (Lord, help your servant, the orthodox faithful emperor, Alexander). The date of this mosaic is debated. If understood as an imperial donation by Alexander himself, it would likely date between the death of Leo VI in 912 and Alexander’s own death in 913, a brief period during which Alexander was regent for Constantine VII. Teteriatnikov 2012 has proposed instead that it may have been a donation of Leo VI, who would have sought to downgrade his brother’s status (following the legitimisation of Constantine VII as the imperial heir) by depicting him in an obscure location. She dates the mosaic prior to Leo’s death, around the time of Constantine VII’s coronation as co-emperor in 908. Also see Underwood and Hawkins 1961.

85 On these mosaics, including discussion of the earlier scholarship on them, see especially Cormack 1994; Teteriatnikov 1996; Brubaker 2010: 37–39.

86 Brubaker 2010: 39; Teteriatnikov 2012: 70.

87 For example, see Whittemore 1938: 220; Mango 1962: 96–97; Brubaker 2010: 50.

88 Kalavrezou 1997 identifies the plaque as a commemorative gift to be distributed on the occasion of Constantine VII’s ascension to the throne. She notes that Constantine’s portrait resembles his depiction in coinage.

89 This suggestion contradicts the standard dating of the mosaic, which is based on a stylistic chronology for the mosaic over the Imperial Door and places it in the late ninth century (see n.20). As noted above, I am not persuaded by the conventional dating and believe the stylistic attribution is in need of reassessment.


91 See also the comments by Prerona Prasad in this volume (Chapter 12).

92 My argument here resonates with that of Holmes 2010: 60, who notes that compilation literature of tenth-century Byzantium – like the *Book of Ceremonies* – often states as a motivation for its composition the desire to make ideas and information easier to grasp.

Chapter 16

1 I thank Shaun Tougher, the Symposiarch of the Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies held at Cardiff in April 2014, for his invitation to participate in the symposium, and for his patience during the editing process. I thank the symposium audience for their valuable comments and suggestions. This chapter benefitted from
conversations with Annemarie Weyl Carr, Anthony Cutler, Antony Eastmond, Brad Hostetler, Tia Kolbaba and Denis Sullivan; I am fortunate to have such generous colleagues. I am indebted once again to Antony Eastmond for permission to use his line drawings.


3 Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *What should be observed when the great and high emperor of the Romans goes on campaign*, ed. and trans. Haldon 1990, Text C: 104–109. For the emperor on campaign see also Chapter 9 by Frank Trombley and Shaun Tougher in this volume.


6 Mullett 2013; Jeffreys 2000; Anderson and Jeffreys 1994. I thank Margaret for graciously providing the texts of lectures she presented while this volume was forthcoming, and so could not be considered here, and a draft of her forthcoming article ‘Tents in space, space in tents’, to be included in a volume on *Courts on the Move: Perspectives from the Global Middle Ages* (Mullet forthcoming).

7 I first presented this idea, in much reduced form, at the 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies in 2006, in a panel I co-ordinated for the occasion: Jones 2006. I thank the audience for their comments and encouragement to further explore the subject.

8 McCormick 1985: 19, for a discussion of the use of purple garments in allowing the emperor to be identified in processions. For a similar use of bright colors for royal display and visibility, see the neon green suit worn by Queen Elizabeth II for her 90th birthday celebration: Hunt 2016.


11 Psellos, *Chronographia* 3.10.6–10, trans. Sewter 1966: 69: ‘...necklaces and bracelets and diadems, pearls and precious stone even more costly, all kinds of glorious booty’.


13 Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *What should be observed when the great and high emperor of the Romans goes on campaign*, ed. and trans. Haldon 1990, Text C: 106–107, with the instructions that the chapel is to be carried not by the *minsourator*, but rather by the *primikerios* of the *vestiarion*. The *minsourator* carries the ‘sacred vessels’, while the *vestiarion* is in charge of the liturgical books.

14 Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *What should be observed when the great and high emperor of the Romans goes on campaign*, ed. and trans. Haldon 1990, Text C: 124–125, ‘a *koubikoularios* carrying the holy and life-giving wood of the Cross, with the case about his neck’ and a ‘*signophoros* bearing a golden, bejewelled cross’.

15 Some examples from the Middle Byzantine period are discussed, with bibliography, in Mergiali-Sahas 2001; Sullivan 2012; Nelson 2011–2012; and Nancy Ševčenko 1994.


17 For the procedure on accepting petitions, see Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *What should be observed when the great and high emperor of the Romans goes on campaign*, ed. and trans. Haldon 1990, Text C: 124–127.
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18 Constantine Porphyrogennetos, *What should be observed when the great and high emperor of the Romans goes on campaign*, ed. and trans. Haldon 1990, Text C: 104–107 (for the cushions), 108–109 (for the chalices and chamber pots).


20 For a discussion and bibliography of contemporary texts concerning this event, see Jones and Maguire 2002.


30 Davit III and Bagrat Bagrationi, portrayed in low relief on the south facade of Osk Vank, now in central Turkey. Contemporary imperial imagery shows the emperor in the loros rather than the chlamys: Eastmond 1998: 26–27, 228–230.


32 For the *Book of Ceremonies* see also Chapter 12 by Prerona Prasad and Chapter 15 by Alicia Walker in this volume.

33 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 566–598. The excellent article by Angelidi 2013 provided a foundation upon which to build my argument.

34 I restrict my comments to particular aspects of ceremonial in two great halls of the Great Palace. Much of the important work has been done recently: see for example Maguire, ed. 1996; Ödelam, Necipoğlu and Akyürek, eds. 2013; Beihammer, Constantinou and Parani, eds. 2013.

35 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 566–579 (for the basic template). For the expedition from Tarsus see Moffat and Tall 2012: 570–592; for that from Cordoba see Moffat and Tall 2012: 570–571, 580; for that from Amida see Moffat and Tall 2012: 593, for that of Olga see Moffat and Tall 2012: 594–598.

36 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 570–571.

37 For the pentapyrgion see *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 586, 593.

38 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 593.

39 See the appendices in Angelidi 2013.

40 The instructions for ordering the rank and file, and for their costumes, begins with those in the Magnaura and works outward, culminating at the Chalke: *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 574–579.
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41 On the chains see *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 570, 571 (for the polykandela).
42 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 571.
43 For the definition of sendal, see *LBG* 1540, s.v. ‘σενδές’. For the objects, see *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 571.
50 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 582.
52 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 582.
53 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 582.
57 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 573. Perhaps these were for ‘quotidian’ use in the Chrysotriklinos, and thus available when the Easter template was installed, with gold curtains.
60 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 586.
63 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 584.
64 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 569.
72 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 571.
73 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 571.
75 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 593.
76 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 593.
78 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 597–598.
83 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 566, when the senate assembles to change into ceremonial costume.
84 *De cer.* 2.15, trans. Moffat and Tall 2012: 578.
85 It is hard to imagine someone less impressionable than Psellos, but when he led an embassy to Isaac I Komnenos (1057–1059) he described the experience of the campaign palace as ‘an imperial spectacle’, ‘capable of overawing anyone’: *Chronographia*
7.23–24, trans. Sewter 1966: 288–289. His description focuses on the choreographed roar of the assembled army and the varied, splendid appearance of Isaac’s attendants (one ‘tribe painted themselves and plucked out their eyebrows’) as much as it does on the imperial tent and its decorations.
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40 LRA1/2; Doyle 1998; Doyle 1999; Kelly 2008: 16–17; Doyle 2009: Table 2.
43 Morrisson 2014: 215, Fig. 217.
44 Harris 2003; Georganteli 2012: 674.
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48 Georganteli 2012: 678.
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